THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXL, No. 5 MAY, 1959

CONTENTS

Holy Mary ..... *William J. McDonald* 289
The Layman as a Proponent of Catholic Theology
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 293
Artificial Insemination ..... *Joseph T. Leonard, S.S.J.* 301
The Chicago Home Study School
Maurice M. Fitzgerald, C.S.P. 308
Why Teenagers Go Steady ..... *Norman G. Werling, O.Carm.* 319
The Use of "Ekklesia" in the New Testament. Part II.
John L. Murphy 325
Technical Excellence in the Teaching of Catholic Doctrine
Joseph Clifford Fenton 333

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Sacerdos Caecutiens 343
Purifying the Communion Plate 344
Transferring the Holy Eucharist 344
Formula for the Blessing of Throats 345
Vocalizing the Sacramental Penance 346
A Marriage Case in the Hospital 346

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1959 by the Catholic University of America Press.

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

The Sacrament of Penance Administered by an Orthodox Priest 347
Photography in Church 348
Use of the Faculty of Bination 348
A Bribe for Holy Communion 349

BOOK REVIEWS

The Scholastic Analysis of Usury, *by John T. Noonan, Jr.* 350
New Testament Introduction, *by Alfred Wikenhauser* 352
Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs, *by Francis X. Weiser, S.J.* 353
Portrait of a Parish Priest, *by Lancelot C. Sheppard* 355
The Restless Christian, *by Kilian McDonnell, O.S.B.* 356
Holiness is for Everyone, *by Martial Lekeux, O.F.M.* 357
Mother of God, *by Cyril Bernard, O.D.C.* 357

BOOKS RECEIVED 359

Ordination Gift Suggestion . . .

It is generally recognized that one of the best habits a young priest can form is that of good reading, in line with his calling and the problems and interests of the priesthood.

In view of the forthcoming ordinations throughout the country, what more appropriate and effective way is there of forming this habit than by giving a gift subscription to—

The American Ecclesiastical Review

We believe that the time to start is during the seminary days. The seminarian who begins his subscription at least the year before ordination is most likely to continue his interest later on.

To stimulate this interest, we are offering a special rate to SEMINARIANS of $3.50 per year, which is less than the actual cost of publication . . . the regular price being $5.00 a year.

Special Rate for Newly Ordained—$4.00

Make out your list and send today to:—

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

620 Michigan Ave., N.E. **Washington 17, D. C.**

HOLY MARY

No creature can be called holy except in terms of relationship to God. True holiness means union with God and detachment from all that is evil. It has been said that "a saint is a soul which retires into God, absorbed only in Him, in His wisdom, His love, His beauty, His beatitude." In such absorption one best resembles Him Who is the Holy of Holies. Bowed down in adoration before Him the seraphim sing: "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of hosts."[1] But the Church also calls Mary, God's Mother thrice holy. In the Litany we begin with the triple salutation: "Holy Mary, Holy Mother of God, Holy Virgin of Virgins." The two latter as well as all the invocations that follow are really clarifications and developments of "Holy Mary." Amongst creatures Mary verifies in a unique manner the meaning of holiness. She is entirely for God and is separated from all evil.

Holiness is realized in two ways, (1) in the union of one's being with God through grace, and (2) in the union of one's will with God's will (moral holiness) which ultimately consists in love. This double element is also verified in the case of Mary. She has the fullness of grace, hence her close connection with the Source of all grace. Friethoff points out that:

> The moral concept of human, supernatural holiness brings with it evidently: i) union with God (God dwells in us and we in him); ii) Favor in God's eyes (we are his friends and children); iii) Consequent right to heavenly glory (we are his heirs); iv) Purity from sin (we do all he commands).[2]

All these requirements are found in Mary. The second, namely, favor in God's eyes, is one of the meanings of Gabriel's "full of grace." So true is it that Mary found favor and was "graced" in the sight of God that the phrase "full of grace" is used in place of her name. The *Magnificat* and the beatitudes offer fruitful sources for meditation in this respect. Commenting on "Blessed are the clean of heart for they shall see God" Fathers Dwyer and Holland observe:

[1] *Isaias* 6:3.

[2] Caspar X. J. M. Friethoff, O. P. *A Complete Mariology*. Translated by a Religious of the Sacred Heart. (London: Blackfriars Publications, and Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1958), p. 69.

Our Lady was clean of heart in the sense that her heart was cleansed of all self seeking. It was utterly filled with the love of God. Her spotless purity was one consequence of that. Her chastity in her love for Joseph was another. This cleanness of heart comes from her fullness of grace and therefore she is inviolate, a mother in whom motherhood and virginity each reach their perfection.[3]

The secret of Mary's power and prerogatives is also indicated in the *Magnificat,* especially in the words "Because he who is mighty has done great things for me, and holy is his name."

Referring specifically to her Immaculate Conception the opening passage of the bull, *Ineffabilis Deus,* emphasizes that the holiness of the Blessed Virgin is next only to that of God.

From the very beginning, and before time began, the Eternal Father chose and prepared for His only begotten Son a Mother in whom the Son of God would become incarnate and from whom, in the blessed fullness of time, he would be born into this world. Above all creatures, did God so love her that the Father was truly well pleased in her with singular delight. He therefore filled her far more than all the angelic spirits and all the saints, with an abundance of all heavenly gifts from the treasury of His divinity, in such a wonderful manner that she would always be free from absolutely every stain of sin, and that, all beautiful and perfect, she might display such fullness of innocence and holiness that under God none greater is known, and which, God excepted, no one can attain even in thought.

It may be safely said that whenever one hears the term "Holy Mary" he will soon be told the reason why in the next phrase or invocation. In the Hail Mary and in the Litany it is followed in quick succession by the title "Mother of God." In the Divine Praises they occur in the same sentence. The language of our daily prayers, like the language of the liturgy, is close to reality—close to the truth that all Mary's glories are for the sake of her Son. In treating of this subject St. Thomas Aquinas says:

The nearer one approaches to a principle the more one participates in its effects. . . . Now Christ is the principle of the life of grace, authoritatively as to this Divinity, instrumentally as to His humanity. . . . But the Blessed Virgin Mary was nearest to Christ in His

---

[3] George Dwyer and Thomas Holland, *Mary.* (London: Paternoster Publications Ltd., 1956), p. 61.

humanity: because He received His human nature from her. Therefore she received a fullness of grace surpassing that of all other creatures.[4]

It is interesting to note that the colloquial term in Greek for referring to the Mother of God is simply *He Panagia,* or *The All-Holy.* The oval medallion worn by Byzantine bishops instead of, or sometimes together with, the pectoral cross is called a *panagia* and is an image of Our Lady.

Much thought has been given in recent times to the relationship of Mary to the Church. Attempts have been made to establish points of comparison between the two especially from the point of view of holiness. Father Vollert's scholarly essay on "Mary and the Church" is most instructive in this respect. Here he develops the theses that while the sanctity of Mary is essentially the same as regards its origin it is, nevertheless, superior to that of the Church. Both are holy because of their relation to the Saviour but the holiness of Mary is that of the Mother of Christ whereas the holiness of the Church is that of His Spouse.

Mary's entire life and each of her actions were always and undeviatingly directed toward God. No obstacle, no inordinate love of creatures, no weariness, hesitancy or tepidity, ever slowed down the flight of her soul. But in the Church the flowering of grace varies according to persons, times, and places. Its ascent towards God is paralyzed by the infirmities of its members, so that the Church always remains below the level of holiness which the power of grace is able to bestow.[5]

Mary progressed from holiness to holiness. Each step increased the capacity of her soul for further grace that promptly filled it to repletion. The grace of the Church also grows, aspiring to the full measure of the stature of Christ, and time is doled out to us on earth to permit this development.

Sanctity flowers into glory and resurrection. Glory is the refulgence of holiness, and the resurrection is its final triumph. The Church still awaits this consummation. . . . But Mary is now in glory; prior to the Church, she was taken up to heaven, body and soul. She has realized in her personal destiny what the Church has yet to realize in

---

[4] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica,* IIIa, q. 27, art. 5.

[5] Cyril Vollert, S.J., S.T.D. "Mary and the Church," *Mariology,* by Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M. Milwaukee: 1957, II, 557-80.

its collective destiny. Yet her Assumption, coming at the climax of her last fullness of grace, prefigures and anticipates the assumption of the Church.[6]

Mary's holiness should not be considered as a personal endowment, but rather as something having worldwide significance because part of the plan of the Redemptive Incarnation. "She is the brightness of eternal light, the unspotted mirror of God's majesty, and the image of His Goodness." Therefore, she should provide practical inspiration for our ordinary daily lives. Pope Pius XII in an address on July 26, 1954, to the pilgrims of St. Anne d'Auray, in Brittany, says of Our Lady,

> We know of no miracle she performed, no extraordinary action, but she loved God with all of her heart, all of her soul, all of her spirit, and all of her strength. This is the first commandment. And she loved her neighbor as herself. There is no other commandment greater than these.

Two statements of Our Blessed Lord cannot be stressed too much in this connection. To those who told Him that His mother and brethren were waiting outside to see Him He said, "My mother and my brethren are they who hear the word of God and act upon it,"[7] while to the tribute "Blessed is the womb that bore thee and the breasts that nursed Thee," His answer was, "Rather, blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it."[8] Finally, the question as to why she is so holy was really answered by Our Lady herself. When she was greeted by the angel as "full of grace" she said simply, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord,"[9] thereby showing her perfect understanding that whatever she had in the order of grace was God's gift to be used in accordance with His purpose. Mary is indeed the masterpiece of God.

WILLIAM J. MCDONALD

Rector Magnificus
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Luke* 8: 21. For an elaboration of this and related texts see Renato Laurentin, "Santita di Cristo e di Maria," *Enciclopedia Cattolica*, Città del Vaticano, 1953, X, col. 1873-77.

[8] *Luke* 11:27 f.

[9] *Luke* 1:38.

THE LAYMAN AS A PROPONENT OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY

The Catholic Church has no objection to the study of theology by its lay members. On the contrary, the Church encourages both laymen and laywomen to devote themselves toward acquiring a deep and extensive scientific knowledge of the truths of faith as they have been explained and clarified by saints and scholars down through the centuries. Some of the most outstanding theological literature has been translated from the original Greek or Latin into living languages—for example, the writings of the Fathers and the *Summa* of St. Thomas—in order that it may be more widely available to lay Catholics. Indeed, at The Catholic University of America a layman with the requisite scholastic background, such as the knowledge of philosophy, Latin and Greek, and with the permission of his Ordinary, could gain admission to the School of Sacred Theology, and could even gain the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology if he passed the required examinations.

It is most encouraging to see the interest in the Church's teachings that has grown among the laity in recent years, especially in the United States. Study clubs and forums, lectures and adult education programs, summer courses in religious education at our colleges and universities, etc., give convincing evidence of the enthusiastic desire on the part of some of our lay Catholics to acquire a deeper knowledge of Catholic doctrine. And, through active participation in the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine thousands of zealous Catholic laymen and laywomen are striving to pass on their knowledge of the Church's teachings to the youth of our nation.

However, lay persons must ever remember that they may speak and write on matters of Catholic doctrine only with the authorization of the official teachers of the Church, the bishops. This point was clearly emphasized by Pope Pius XII in his discourse to those members of the hierarchy who were present in Rome for the canonization of St. Pius X on May 31, 1954:

> As for the laity, it is clear that they can be invited by legitimate teachers and accepted as helpers in the defense of the faith. It is enough to call to mind the thousands of men and women engaged in catechetical work and other types of lay apostolate, all of which are highly praise-

worthy and can be strenuously promoted. But all these lay apostles must be, and remain, under the authority, leadership and watchfulness of those who by divine institution are set up as teachers of Christ's Church. In matters involving the salvation of souls there is no teaching authority in the Church not subject to this authority and vigilance.

Recently what is called "lay theology" has sprung up and spread to various places, and a new class of "lay theologians" has emerged, which claims to be *sui juris*. . . . They appeal to history, which from the beginning of the Christian religion down to today presents so many names of laymen who, for the good of souls, have taught the truth of Christ orally and in writing, though not called to this by the bishops and without having asked or received the sacred teaching authority, led on by their own inward impulse and apostolic zeal.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to maintain to the contrary that there never has been, there is not now, and there never will be in the Church a legitimate teaching authority of the laity withdrawn by God from the authority, guidance and watchfulness of the sacred teaching authority. In fact, the very denial of submission offers a convincing proof and criterion that laymen who thus speak and act are not guided by the Spirit of God and of Christ.[1]

Three years later, in addressing the Second World Congress for the Lay Apostolate, Pope Pius XII repeated his admonition regarding "lay theology" and "lay theologians":

It is sufficient to repeat what We laid down in 1951 as a general guide: that the lay apostolate "must always remain within the limits of orthodoxy and must not oppose itself to the legitimate prescriptions of competent ecclesiastical authority" (*Discorsi e Radiomessaggi*, vol. XIII, p. 298). Since that time We have been compelled to refute an erroneous opinion on "lay theology" which derived from an inexact concept of the responsibility of the layman. (Allocution *"Si diligis,"* May 31, 1954: *Discorsi e Radiomessaggi*, vol. XVI, p. 45). The term "lay theology" is without any meaning whatsoever. The rule which applies to the lay apostolate in general, which We have just recalled, is naturally valid, and even more so, for the "lay theologian." And if he wishes to publish writings on theological matters, the layman also needs the explicit approval of ecclesiastical authority.[2]

It is especially in the matter of publication that the Catholic layman must be on his guard—and be guarded by his ecclesiastical

[1] In *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXXI, 2 (Aug., 1954), 136.
[2] *The Pope Speaks*, 1957, III, 126.

superiors—lest he represent Catholic doctrine inadequately or incorrectly. It is true, some laymen have received a thorough course in theology. Thus, there are some who have completed the theological course in a seminary in preparation for the priesthood, but have then decided that this was not their vocation. A few have taken the entire course of theology as laymen in an approved theological institution, such as The Catholic University of America. But these are the exceptions. The vast majority of our laity who can be said to possess some theological knowledge have acquired it by diligent private study, by attendance at forums and lectures, etc. Now, while these persons are to be commended for their zeal and devotion, and encouraged to continue their study of Catholic teaching, they cannot be designated theologians in the correct sense of the word, any more than a man who has privately studied books on medicine can be called a doctor. They cannot be expected to write on highly technical and abstruse theological topics without any assistance and with the assurance that they will propose a correct and adequate explanation of the Church's teachings. Hence, if a layman essays to publish a book or article on theological topics, he should seek the assistance of some competent theologian. Furthermore, our Catholic laity should know that the Code of Canon Law prescribes that any writings intended for publication, whether by a priest or by a lay person, bearing on sacred theology, sacred scripture, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics or any other religious and moral subjects must first receive the approval of a local Ordinary—either the Ordinary of the author, or the Ordinary of the place where the work is published or the Ordinary of the place where it is printed.[3]

One type of Catholic layman who can very easily do harm to the Church is the person who writes a letter for publication to a periodical protesting against some statement that has appeared in its columns insulting or misrepresenting Catholic faith or worship. The zeal of these correspondents is admirable; but sometimes it is an imprudent zeal since the writer fails to give a satisfactory or even logical refutation of the disparaging statement, and only draws down ridicule and contempt on the Catholic religion. Our laity should be warned not to be too ready to write such letters of protest,

[3] Can. 1385.

or at least to seek advice and help from a competent theologian before sending such a letter.

There appeared in *Harper's Magazine* for March, 1959, an article entitled "What a Modern Catholic Believes," written by Mr. Philip Scharper, formerly one of the editors of *Commonweal,* now connected with the firm of Sheed and Ward. Some parts of the article are excellent, such as the writer's manifestation of a deep devotion to the Holy Eucharist, and his appreciation of the privilege of receiving the whole Christ, not in metaphor but in very truth, in Holy Communion.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. Scharper has presented Catholic doctrine in such a manner that the reader might be led to believe that the basis of Catholic faith is not the authority of God, made known and guaranteed by objective criteria, especially miracles,[4] but is rather a subjective emotional adherence to the Person of Christ. Thus, he says:

> There are many reasons for this faith but the most important one for me is contained in the word Person. For the Catholic the experience of Christ is an encounter with a Person. . . . The experience of Christ as a Person stands at the center of all Catholicism, and for me the discovery of it, after the years of smug observance and the crisis of doubt I have described, was the beginning of real understanding of the Catholic faith, the divine revelations on which it is based, and the role of the Church in it. I began to understand that religion is the surrender of the human being to an invading God and the function of the Church is to make clear the terms of that surrender. The Church tries to insure that the worshiper is not panicked or scared into retreat by his religious feeling but shows him a way in which he can fully give himself to the Person he has come to know as all-loving.[5]

Again, when Mr. Scharper endeavors to explain why he could not choose Judaism or Protestantism in place of Catholicism, he has recourse to the same type of subjective argumentation:

> I feel that both Protestantism and Judaism suffer from a cast of mind which I would call Grecian—an affinity for the abstract and a corresponding uneasiness in the presence of the definite, the felt, the experienced. . . . The relation to God of many Jews I know does not

---

[4] Cf. *Denz.*, 1790, 1813.

[5] *Harper's Magazine,* March, 1959, pp. 41 f.

seem an intimate one, and sometimes seems uneasy and uncertain, however it may have been in the past. Contemporary Protestantism seems to me to exhibit a similar drive toward the abstract or at least the partial.[6]

There is no indication here that the basic reason for accepting the divine origin of Catholic faith is the historical facts that Jesus Christ proved the divinity of His mission by external proofs, and that the Catholic Church demonstrates by external signs that it was established by Jesus Christ as a necessary means of salvation for all men. There is no indication that the fundamental reason why Catholics regard Judaism and Protestantism as unacceptable is that these creeds are proved historically to exist contrary to the will of God—the former because it has been supplanted by the religion established by the Son of God, the latter because it was established by human beings in opposition to the true Church of Christ. Of course, it is true that these religions cannot satisfy satisfactorily the cravings of the soul as Catholicism can do, but this is the result of the objective fact that they are false and Catholicism is true, not the reason for this fact.

A half-century ago Pope St. Pius X expressed in the Oath against Modernism the true Catholic concept of faith, in contrast to the notions of faith prevailing among the Modernists. The most pertinent passages read:

> I admit and acknowledge as the most certain signs of the divine origin of the Christian religion external arguments for revelation, in the first place miracles and prophecies, and I hold these to be most suited to the intelligence of all times and men, even of the present time. . . . I hold most certainly and profess sincerely that faith is not a blind religious feeling bursting forth from the depths of the subconscious, under the pressure of the heart and the impulse of the will morally formed, but a true assent of the intellect to truth extrinsically accepted by hearing, whereby namely we believe those things to be true which have been spoken, attested and revealed by a personal God, our Creator and Lord, because of the authority of the supremely truthful God.[7]

This correct concept of Catholic faith is sadly lacking in Mr. Scharper's article. On the contrary his description of his motive for accepting Catholicism—"It is precisely the lack of emphasis on the

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 47 f.
[7] *Denz.*, 2145.

personal and the intimate which makes the other faiths I know of untenable for me"[8]—undoubtedly bears a resemblance to the subjectivism of the Modernists.

Again, it is difficult to understand how Mr. Scharper can assert, consistently with Catholic principles: "I think only equitable the recent decision of the New York City hospitals which permits doctors to use birth-control therapy if the patient desires."[9] How can a procedure which is contrary to the law of God be equitable, if this word be taken in its usual sense of "characterized by equity or fairness and just dealing"?

Mr. Scharper tells us that he reads books that oppose Catholic teaching, such as the writings of Renan and Rousseau.[10] Now, the Catholic Church does not object to the perusal of such works by those who have sufficient knowledge to perceive the errors they contain, and who have sufficient reasons to read them, such as the intention to refute them. In such cases, however, permission to read these writings must be obtained. Apart from these conditions, such writings are forbidden to all Catholics, clerical and lay. The Church does not deem it necessary to make any excuses for this exercise of her authority. For the Church knows full well that many Catholics have not the necessary knowledge and astuteness to read such writings without danger to their faith. In recent years this policy of the Church has been confirmed by the success achieved by Communists in winning converts through their cleverly written books. Even intelligent persons have been led astray by such writings. Consequently, no loyal military commander would allow such books to be kept in the post library, available to all the soldiers. That is the same attitude that is taken by the Catholic Church regarding writings contrary to the faith.

Mr. Scharper himself may have ecclesiastical permission to read the books he mentions. I sincerely trust that as a good Catholic he would observe this law of the Church in this matter. But I believe that he should mention this fact in his article, lest the impression be given that a Catholic layman has the right to read whatever he wishes, without regard for the legislation of the Church.

[8] *Harper's Magazine,* March, 1959, p. 47.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 49.
[10] *Ibid.,* p. 41.

What should be the policy of the priest in regard to laymen (or laywomen) who wish to publish a book or an article on theological matters? In the first place, the pastor of such persons should strongly recommend that they contact a competent theologian and ask him to examine what they wish to publish. Even if there is question of only a letter to a periodical, this should be done. If the pastor believes that he himself is not adequately equipped to give assistance, he should refer the lay person to a specialist in theology. It should be added that permission of the Ordinary (as explained above) should also be sought.

However, when a lay person wishes to write a letter or even an article for publication in a Catholic periodical, this permission need not be sought, since the editor of such a publication presumably is delegated by the Ordinary to judge what is suitable to be printed.

Secondly, when an article by a Catholic purporting to represent Catholic doctrine does appear in a book or magazine, our Catholic people should be made aware of any objectionable features it may contain. Unfortunately, Catholics are sometimes so pleased that a secular magazine has invited a Catholic to contribute an article on his faith that they overlook even grave blunders in his presentation of Catholic doctrine. This is a deplorable perversion of values. It is true, some non-Catholics may be led to a higher appreciation of the Catholic religion by any article on Catholicism by an intelligent Catholic with a great love for his faith. But, whatever benefit may come in this way, it is far outweighed by the harm that is done when such an article presents an erroneous or inadequate explanation of Catholic doctrine. Hence, we should not hesitate to point out to those who might read the article the matters in which it fails. Diocesan papers can do a good service in this way.

In regard to the particular article with which we are concerned, the archdiocesan paper of St. Louis carried this editorial comment:

> Let us take the article by Philip Scharper in the current issue of *Harper's Magazine*. The title is "What a Modern Catholic Believes." An analytical Protestant reader might start right there being confused. Does this article represent what a "modern" Catholic believes in contrast to his predecessors in the faith? Is this what one "modern" Catholic believes in contrast to the beliefs of many of his contemporaries? Is what the "modern" Catholic believes precisely what the Church teaches him to believe or is it what he chooses to believe?

When Mr. Scharper says, "I would not imply that this theme (personal contact with God) was missing from either Judaism or Protestantism, or indeed that agnostics, humanists or other secular thinkers were unaware of it. But it is precisely the lack of emphasis on the personal and the intimate which makes other faiths I know of untenable to me," he infers a comparative test on the basis of subjective feelings.

Would it not be better to say that other faiths are untenable to the believing Catholic simply because he is certain that his Church was founded by Christ, Who is God, and the others were not? Is that too blunt? Should we talk all around it and not say it? It isn't meant to be an insult; it's simply meant to be an objective fact that can be proved by history and scripture and accepted by anyone who has the help of grace.[11]

Certainly, my purpose is not to restrict lay Catholics in their laudable desire to explain and to defend Catholic truth when the opportunity is given them. On the contrary, they should be encouraged to make use of such opportunities, which sometimes are offered by publications that would not invite a priest to contribute an article. Moreover, many readers will be more impressed by an article from the pen of a layman than by one written by a professional theologian, for it shows that a scientific understanding of the Catholic faith is not confined to the clergy, but falls within the scope of any intelligent person. However, the layman who wishes to exercise an apostolate of this kind must ever remember the words of Pope Pius XII: "There never has been, there is not now, and there never will be in the Church a legitimate teaching authority of the laity withdrawn by God from the authority, guidance and watchfulness of the sacred teaching authority."[12]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[11] *St. Louis Review*, March 6, 1959, p. 12.
[12] *The American Ecclesiastical Review, loc. cit.*

ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

Recently a Scottish divorce case attracted the attention of American newspaper readers because of the grounds on which the court was asked to issue the divorce. The husband claimed that his wife, from whom he had been separated and who had been living in America for over a year, had given birth to a baby girl. He charged that she must have committed adultery, and asked the court to grant the divorce. The wife replied that she had not committed adultery. The child, she said, was the result of artificial insemination. The husband countered that he had never agreed to her act and insisted on the divorce: "Was such an act adultery? A sin, or a triumph of science? Last year these questions were exercising the best legal, religious and journalistic minds of Britain."[1]

So reported *Time* in its account of the trial. The husband's lawyer, pressing the claim, stated that the essence of adultery consists in the "surrender of a woman's reproductive organs to another man," and that the method of accomplishment is unimportant. In a preliminary ruling, the judge agreed, but said that in this case it was the surrender of the woman's reproductive organs to a test tube and not to another man, and he handed down the ruling that it did not constitute adultery in its legal meaning.

This ruling raised a storm of controversy in the secular press and a vast amount of discussion. Finally, Geoffrey Fisher, Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, declared that artificial insemination was "something far less responsible and far less human than adultery." However, while admitting the sinfulness of the act, the Archbishop did not clearly state that it was adultery.

However, much earlier than this, on September 29, 1949, Pope Pius XII, addressing the Fourth International Convention of Catholic Doctors, treated the problem of artificial insemination, and he answered several points in regard to it. In his message, he stated:

> Outside of marriage, artificial insemination is to be condemned absolutely and simply as immoral. The natural law and the divine positive law are such that procreation of a new life can be the fruit

---

[1] *Time* (January 27, 1958), p. 23.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of marriage only. Only marriage safeguards the dignity of the spouses (in this case, principally the woman's). . . . Consequently no difference of opinion is possible among Catholics about the condemnation of artificial insemination outside of marriage. A child conceived under these conditions, by that very fact, would be illegitimate. Within marriage, artificial insemination, using the active element of a third party is equally immoral, and as such, is to be reproved without appeal.

Only spouses have a reciprocal right to their bodies to beget a new life, and this is an exclusive, unceasing, and inalienable right. And it should also be in consideration of the child. By this relationship, whoever gives life to a child is given, by nature, charge of its care and education. But between the husband and the child who is the product of the active element of a third party (even if the husband was willing), there is no bond of origin, no moral or juridic bond of conjugal procreation.[2]

The Pope distinguished between an unmarried woman undergoing artificial insemination and a married woman undergoing it using a donor other than her husband.[3] The first case he clearly states is positively immoral, that there can be no opposite opinion or even discussion as to possibility of licitness. He states that the child would be illegitimate. However, at first glance it may appear that the case is not as clear or as firm in the instance of the married woman. A more careful study of the passage though will show:

1. He clearly states that it is immoral. (. . . within marriage, artificial insemination, using the active element of a third party, is equally immoral.)

2. He precludes the possibility of an opposite opinion among Catholics. (. . . is equally immoral, and as such, is to be reproved without appeal.)

3. Finally, he indicates implicitly that the child would be illegitimate. (. . . between the husband and the child . . . there is no bond of origin, no moral or juridic bond of conjugal procreation.)

Despite this statement regarding the immorality of artificial insemination many seem to hesitate to call the act fornication or

[2] Pius XII, "Address to the Fourth International Convention of Catholic Doctors," *AAS*, XLI (1949), 557-561. ("Le corps humain," *Les enseignements pontificaux*, 166-179.)

[3] Medical men term artificial insemination by a donor (heterologus), as *AID*, whereas artificial insemination by the husband (homologous) is termed *AIH*.

adultery. Yet it is important to determine precisely the nature of this sin.

The chief reason for hesitating seems to be that we have overemphasized the aspect of violation of temperance involved in these sins, and we regard them as sins of intemperance. At the same time, we consider the violation of justice in adultery merely as a circumstance. In other words, we look upon sins against the Sixth Commandment as having no relation to the virtue of justice except that accidental relationship introduced because one of the parties is married. The result is that in acts known to be sinful where we cannot verify inordinate sensual pleasure, we hesitate to say they are against the Sixth Commandment.

Perhaps we need a re-evaluation of our estimate of the essence of this type of sin to see if we are not overlooking or forgetting an important element. In treating of the virtue of chastity, the standard textbooks define it as being concerned with control of venereal pleasure:

Merkelbach states it is "a virtue moderating the sexual appetite,"[4] while Noldin states chastity is "a moral virtue which excludes or moderates the appetite for venereal pleasure."[5] Henry Davis writes that "chastity is the moral virtue that controls in the married and altogether excludes in the unmarried all voluntary expression of the sensitive appetite for venereal pleasure."[6] Dublanchy, in his article in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* says that chastity "inclines one to abstain from all voluntary carnal pleasure, even that permitted in the marriage state or at least to regulate its usage according to divine law."[7] Finally, St. Thomas calls it "a special virtue having a special matter, namely, the concupiscences of venereal pleasures."[8]

Thus there seems to be agreement that chastity is a virtue concerned with *control* of the appetite for venereal pleasure, and when we find a disordering of this control, we have a defect of chastity. However, are we correct in thinking of sins against the Sixth Commandment as being solely opposed to this ordering. In

[4] Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis,* II, 994.
[5] Noldin, *De castitate,* No. 1.
[6] Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology,* II, 200.
[7] Dublanchy, "Chasteté," *DTC,* II, col. 2319.
[8] *II-II,* q. 151, a. 2, corpus.

other words, are they forbidden only because they violate the virtue of chastity?

Saint Thomas presents an interesting objection to the gravity of the sin of fornication. It is based on a quotation from Saint Augustine stating that as food is to the health of the body, so is sexual relations to the health of the race. The objection continues that not every inordinate use of food is mortally sinful, hence not every inordinate use of sex, especially fornication, is a mortal sin. Saint Thomas solves this objection, stating:

> From a single intercourse, a child can be begotten, and hence an inordinate intercourse which impedes the good of the child to be born is, from the very nature of the act, a mortal sin, and is so not only because of the disorder of concupiscence.[9]

Thus, he does not believe that the sinfulness of fornication comes merely from the fact that there is inordinate concupiscence. Rather, he states there is a two-fold malice in this sin. What then is this second malice in the sin of fornication? A study of some of our modern authors will cast some light on this other malice. Noldin states, in treating of fornication, that it "tends to the harm of human society, because the care of the child, whose proper education requires not only the care of a mother, but also the care of a father, is not sufficiently provided for, hence it is gravely prohibited by the natural law."[10]

Merkelbach quotes Billuart's commentary on the *Summa* notes that "it implies a disordination which tends to the grave harm not only of the child who is to be born from such intercourse, but also to the common good and the good of human society."[11]

This comment of Billuart is based on Saint Thomas' position which is most clearly stated in the *Contra Gentes*: "The generation of a child would be frustrated unless his proper care would also be provided. . . . Thus to be an ordered emission of seed, both the generation of the child and his education would have to follow."[12]

Thus Saint Thomas indicates that frustration of generation consists not only in prevention of conception, but also in lack of proper

[9] *II-II*, q. 154, a. 2, ad 6.
[10] Noldin, *De castitate*, No. 17.
[11] Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis*, II, 1006.
[12] *Contra Gentes*, III, ch. 122.

education of the child. He states that even if the mother is rich enough to provide for this herself, this is only a *per accidens* situation, and the act is still sinful.

It would seem, therefore, that we must say that sins against the Sixth Commandment derive their malice not only from disordinate seeking of sexual pleasure or the violation of temperance, but also from the infraction of social justice because these sins act to the harm and detriment of the entire human society.[13] It should also be noted that Saint Paul, in speaking of sins against the Sixth Commandment, emphasized not merely the violation of the virtue of temperance, but the violation of the body as part of the body of Christ: "Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of a harlot? God forbid!"[14]

Let us now apply these principles to the problem of artificial insemination. In the case of the unmarried woman, we can immediately see the sinfulness of her act merely from the fact of donation. This will in most instances be directly procured, and will be sinful on the part of the woman because of her cooperation, which will probably be implicitly formal cooperation *ex parte finis operantis*. But what of the case where the semen was obtained by means which would be licit if it were a question of obtaining a sample for medical examination? If we have restricted the notion of fornication to the violation of temperance, it will be very difficult to see how the sin of artificial insemination falls into the category of fornication. Yet we have the Papal teaching that the child would be illegitimate and the act immoral. It seems that we must include this, in some way, under the sin of fornication, and that lack of sensual pleasure should not deter this inclusion. This unmarried woman is using a faculty given, not for the benefit of the individual, but for the good of the human race and its continuation, in such a way that the end of the faculty is frustrated. We have seen that frustration can involve not only generation, but also the education of the child. Hence she is acting against the good of society in general and is violating social justice.

[13] For a discussion of the ethical and sociological aspects and problems caused by artificial insemination, as well as the legal questions, cf. Anthony F. Lo Gatto, "Artificial Insemination," *The Catholic Lawyer* (July, 1955), page 172-184; (October, 1955), page 267-280.

[14] I Cor. 6:15.

Perhaps we may want to restrict use of the term "fornication" and "adultery" to cases in which there is both the violation of social justice and the disordered seeking of pleasure. In this case, we will have to coin a new term to designate a sin against social justice in which there is no element of sensual pleasure.

The same holds true in the case of donor insemination of the married woman. Here too is a lack of sensual delectation. Must we say then that her sin is merely that of cooperation in the illicit donation? Rather, it seems that she too is using part of her body for a purpose in which the *bonum prolis* is actually being frustrated. Here this child will have no bond of origin, no moral or juridic bond with the legal husband. Therefore, this act is against the common good just as fornication, even though the husband be willing and agrees to the insemination and undertakes the education of the child.

The final case of insemination might seem to lack any aspect of a violation of social justice. This is the case of homologous insemination by the husband, where the seed had been obtained by a method which is licit for the obtention of a sample for medical examination. (Here, we wish to by-pass any discussion as to whether the procurement is illicit by reason of end.) Even in this case it seems that the insemination is opposed to social justice. The woman, it is true, acts to accomplish the primary end of her marriage, but nevertheless she is obtaining this end by an inversion of means. God has intended conception to be the result of a human act in a human society. She, by use of these mechanical means, is reducing the human society to an industrial society, and this degradation of society violates social justice. In the address to the Italian Midwives in 1951, Pope Pius XII condemned artificial insemination and stated:

> To reduce cohabitation and the conjugal act to a simple organic function for the transmission of seed would be converting the home, the sanctuary of the family, into a mere biological laboratory.[15]

It would seem that we are safe in stating that artificial insemination is opposed to the Sixth Commandment, just as fornication or adultery, even though there is no sensual delectation. Further, that this applies to all the various situations possible, in which there is

[15] Pius XII, "Address to the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives," (NCWC translation), par. 51.

real artificial insemination, whether it be an unmarried woman, or a married woman utilizing homologous or heterologous insemination; and it would seem too that we can say that the malice of all these sins is the violation of social justice.

JOSEPH T. LEONARD, S.S.J.

St. Joseph's Seminary
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1909, from the pen of M. Nesbitt, of Clevedon, England, is entitled "The Blessed Mother of God in the Literature of the Anglo-Saxon Period." The author gives special attention to the writings of St. Bede, King Alfred, St. Dunstan, and Sedulius. We are told that the hymn *Omni Die Dic Mariae* ("Daily, daily, Sing to Mary") was composed in England in the eleventh century. . . . Fr. M. Martin, S.J., narrates the history and explains the functions of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. He tells us that by a recent ruling of Pope Pius X about 30,000,000 Catholics, including 25,000 priests and 200 bishops were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of this Congregation and placed under the common law of the Church. . . . Bishop Keating, of Northampton, England, contributes an interesting article on "How the English Martyrs Saved the Mass," describing the efforts of the sixteenth and seventeenth century priests to provide the faithful with Mass and Holy Communion. It is surprising to read that frequently the priests imprisoned for the faith said Mass in prison, made converts, gave retreats, and even sometimes gave Benediction. . . . An anonymous article on "The Danger of State Legislature Interfering with our Rights of Education" contains a warning lest secular influences demand the attendance of all children at public schools. The writer quotes the superintendent of public schools in Philadelphia as holding that "the child belongs to the State and the first duty of a child is to the State; his second duty is to his parents." . . . Fr. J. Murphy explains the office and duties of papal nuncios and internuncios and apostolic delegates. . . . This issue also contains three more chapters of Canon Sheehan's novel "The Blindness of the Reverend Dr. Gray." . . . In the Studies and Conferences Fr. P. McDevitt, Superintendent of parochial schools in Philadelphia, recommends the use of the "Batavia System" of education. . . . Fr. Graham, of St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, condemns the use of fairs, bazaars, etc., as means of raising church funds, because they are frequently the occasion of abuses, especially drunkenness. F.J.C.

THE CHICAGO HOME STUDY SCHOOL

This article is concerned with the development of an advertised Home Study School that began in January of 1946, moved from city to city in different States, and is still in operation, with some improvements, but with essentially the same system. It will try to explain in the process how students have been obtained for Catholic Home Study Courses through advertising. Since the story of development of a program naturally requires a background, a brief word about the earlier days of this Advertised School seems to be in order. The story of the earlier days is told in two articles. In the Dec. 1947 issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* there appeared an article by the present writer entitled "Catholic Truth in the Newspapers," which was about an advertised Home Study Course conducted by the Paulist Fathers during the previous year as an experiment in largely non-Catholic Lubbock, Texas. The article described what happened as a result of twelve 3 by 10 ads run over a twelve week period, each ad explaining briefly some phase of Catholic teaching and offering a Free Home Study Course to readers who would send in the coupon attached to the bottom of the ad. The article recounted how 168 persons sent in the coupon requesting the Course, or an average of about 16 returns a week over the twelve week period. There were 68 persons who sent in tests and 17 were known to have been received into the Church after beginning with the Advertised Course.

In 1948 the same Correspondence Advertising System used at Lubbock was inaugurated at the Catholic Information Center conducted by the Paulists in downtown Boston. The results over a two year period in Boston in which thirty display ads were inserted in the metropolitan newspapers were described in an article by this writer, entitled "Newspaper Advertising and Correspondence Courses," which appeared in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for November 1951. Of course the results in Boston with its greater potentialities were much larger and more impressive than those obtained in Lubbock. The article pointed out that as the result of the thirty ads in Boston there were 6276 persons who sent in to the Center for the Course, an average of about 224 returns an ad for the thirty ads. There were 1505, or about 24%, who sent in

tests after receiving the Course, and 248 persons were baptized into the Church or put under personal instruction of a Priest after beginning with the Advertised Course.

In 1952 the same Home Study Advertising System was tried in the Archdiocese of Chicago and this paper will be concerned with explaining the progress of the School during the six year period (1952-58). In 1952 there was already established an advertising program in the Chicago Archdiocese but it was concerned primarily with announcing the beginning of Fall Classes of instruction each year. These courtesy ads of invitation to the Religious Information Classes in the Parishes were carried only in the newspapers. His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch made a significant and important contribution to the progress of the Home Study School in his Archdiocese when he suggested that car cards on buses and subway cars be used to advertise, one side of the card to announce the Information Classes in the Parishes, the other side of the card to offer the Free Home Study Course. Since 1953, car cards in addition to newspaper advertising have been used to advance the Home Study School work in the Archdiocese.

A SYSTEM FOR MAKING CONTACTS

Every Priest and every Catholic knows that in her doctrines the Catholic Religion has the greatest message in the world. Among her proofs she has the most powerful motives of credibility. Among her manifold fruits there are Catholic Churches, Hospitals, Orphanages, Schools and so forth in all the great cities of the country with proportionately large representation in the rural areas. Millions of non-Catholic Americans pass by these fruits of Catholic prayer, work, and charity every day, yet for the most part they see only the accidents and not the substance; they see only the landscape and the buildings and not the faith that inspires and sustains them. Despite all the consistent teachings and divine claims of the Church and in spite of the evidences for good in the numberless charitable institutions confronting them everywhere, they do not seem constrained to think that the Church has any particular message for them, nor do they feel bound in conscience or obligated by evidence to seek out and to study the Catholic Religion because their environment has long told them "It is the same as any other Religion." "They all do good," summarizes their simple, easy-going, religious

philosophy. Such a defense mechanism is difficult for Catholic truth to break through. When they are satisfied with all, or none, why should they study One as unique? There are, after all, only a few approaches possible for contacting non-Catholics with the Catholic message and no known approach has proven itself perfect against the religious defense mechanism of the modern-day indifferentist. This paper certainly is not the complete answer for this complex problem of making contacts for conversions but it tells that it has been ascertained over a period of years and on a local basis that contacts for religious home study of the Catholic Religion can be made with some citizens of a community through public paid advertising.

The Advertised Home Study School makes free information about the Church easily available and in a controlled way. Ads in Chicago are carried on car cards in buses and subway cars and in newspapers. A secular newspaper display ad in itself explains the purpose and a typical newspaper ad runs like this:

FREE HOME STUDY COURSE
ON THE
CATHOLIC RELIGION

It is often said of a Priest or of a Sister that they give up their life to enter the religious order or life! What does that mean? It means, for one thing, that they give up their right to pass on their life. Their life stops with them. They give it up to God!

But why? For one consideration it is a fine test of their religious sincerity. It is a visible and constant witness of their willingness to sacrifice personal preferences for God. It is also a reminder to the world that Religion is sacred, more precious to them than their very lives. Furthermore, it is a ringing challenge to the world that Religion is a powerful attraction to be investigated because people do not freely give up their lives just for a fancy but they must have very powerful evidential reasons for freely cancelling out the continuity of their lives!

How can you learn the reasons that impel people freely to give up their lives for religious motives? You can learn by sending for the Free Home Study Course on the Catholic Religion. Send for this Free Course today and learn the vital evidence that makes Religion more valued than life itself.

Simply fill in the coupon at the bottom of this ad, giving your name, address or box number. Mail to the Information Center and the interesting and informative 212-page Course Book will be mailed to you promptly. Don't delay! Write today!

FREE—At your personal request
Address

Information Center, 21 East Van Buren Street, Chicago 5, Ill.

Please send to me (without obligation) the Free Home Study Course on the Catholic Religion. Thank you.

Name .....

Address .....

City..... Zone..... State.....

Please ( ) check for our accommodation:

( ) I am a Catholic. ( ) I am not a Catholic

Many people answer ads of this type. A considerable number of persons outside the Church have a deeply concealed desire to learn something, especially certain aspects that their own experience makes appealing to them about the Catholic Religion, but they have not sufficient interest to go to a rectory for instruction. They have heard stories about the Catholic Church and certain of her teachings from their earliest years and if the right approach is made, if the appealing reasons can be advanced through advertising to stimulate their deeply concealed desire for further knowledge about the Church, they may, by the grace of God, send for the Home Study Course.

CHICAGO RESULTS

The first year of the Advertised Course in Chicago (Sept. '52-Sept.'53) 2000 persons answered the newspaper ads offering the information and were sent the Course from the Paulist Center. The next year, with the adding of car cards to the newspaper advertising, the number was increased to 4187, the third year 5790, the fourth year 6248, the fifth year 6790, and the six year when "Postage will be paid by Addressee" return post cards were used, the number of yearly enrollees for the Course soared to 10,769. The steady and then rapid increase in the number of enrollees each year was encouraging and the total of 35,784 Free Courses on the Catholic Religion

mailed out during the six year period showed the supporters of the project that the School had permanent characteristics. As an indication of its steady growth in Chicago, the School now uses four Correspondence Courses based on Doctrine, one on the History of the Church, and under preparation there is a Correspondence Course based on the Life of Christ. It is planned to add to and build this nucleus of Home Study Courses into perhaps fifteen or twenty Courses or more explaining various phases of the Catholic Faith for non-Catholics. On completion of one Course an interested person will be able to select another. The Courses that are now available and in use are the following: *A Catholic Primer for Home Study* by M. X. Frassrand, C.S.P., a simple True and False study that seems especially popular with busy men; a leader Course based on the popular new Catechism *Christ in Life* by Fathers Weber and Kilgallon, two Chicago Archdiocesan Priests; a Dogmatic Course based on *I Believe* by Wilfred G. Hurley, C.S.P., a study which has proven its value over a ten year period; the standard *Father Smith Instructs Jackson* by Bishop John F. Noll and Fr. Lester J. Fallon, C.M.

The fourth doctrinal course is one that is very good for recent converts in that it explains simply various practices of the Faith and is based on *Catholic Way of Life* by Wilfred G. Hurley, C.S.P. It is surprising how many persons enroll and send in tests on the complicated and fact-filled History Course. The questions for the Home Study History Course are taken from the well known *A Popular History of the Catholic Church* by Msgr. Philip Hughes.

The System used by the Chicago School is not based on doing everything at once, sending out the Course Book and questions only, but proceeds step by step, one operation at a time. The first operation as was seen is to prepare an appealing ad and to offer persons with varying degrees of interest the opportunity to send for the Course. The next operation is to persuade the recipient of the Course to send in a test and thereby improve his proficiency in learning the subject matter and, at the same time, to let the School know that he is studying the Catholic Religion seriously. One inducement to send in the tests he received with the Course Book is in the form of a letter promising a premium picture or a spiritual reading book on completion of the Course. The offer of a premium injects a note of challenge into the study and stimulates a desire for some

to start working. If the enrollee is not moved and does not send in a test after a reasonable time the next inducement to move him to action is put into automatic operation in the form of follow-up letters. The follow-up letters are spaced weeks apart and are based on motives of apologetics and self-interest. They urge the inquirer to complete the first test and send it in. Thousands of follow-up letters urging the inquirers to send in the tests have been mailed out and no serious objections have ever been raised against this method of maintaining contact with the inquirers because, while some of the letters were clear and explicit on the importance and truth of the Catholic Religion, they never insulted or attacked the inquirer and always respected his intelligence and his integrity.

The first follow-up brought a decided increase in returned tests. The second follow-up brought more but not so many as the first. The third follow-up with an accompanying questionnaire resulted in only a sprinkling of returned tests from the letters.

When the inquirer had completed the first test and mailed it in in the stamped addressed envelope provided, it was corrected for him by the staff of volunteer Lay Actionists and returned together with another test and stamped addressed envelope, and this procedure continued until he had completed the six tests. Upon sending in the first test he joined the list of "active students" to distinguish him from the mere inquirers. It was encouraging and indicative that each year the number of active students in Chicago increased, the first year there were 498 active students, the second year 925, the third year 1125, the fourth year 1165, the fifth year 1457, and the sixth year 1920 active students. A résumé of the six year period showed that 7090 students sent in test one, 5484 test two, 4384 test three, 4072 test four, 3545 test five, and 3422 sent in all six tests and graduated. There were 27,997 tests corrected and mailed back and the School paid the postage both ways for all.

CONVERTS

One of the difficulties of judging the value of a Home Study School of Religion is to assess the intangibles, of which there are admittedly many. To write of intangibles does not mean that there are not definite results that can be checked but rather that there are a number of values connected with the Advertised Course that cannot be accurately weighed. In commenting on the intangibles

Cardinal Stritch wrote: "Statistics will never give the whole of your work. In spreading a knowledge of the Church a great many precious gifts come to souls which cannot be recorded in statistics."

The first year of the Advertised Course in Chicago there were 58 persons who notified the School that they had been received into the Church or were under personal instruction of a Priest with a view to conversion, the second year there were 142, the third year there were 285, the fourth year there were 253, the fifth year there were 261, the sixth year there were 225. In the six year period there were 1214 persons who were known to be converts after beginning with the Course or who were under personal instruction at the time they informed the School.

COSTS

To give a complete picture of the operation of a Home Study School the costs also have to be taken into consideration. In computing the costs in this case, it is fair to divide the Archdiocesan advertising expense by two, because half of the advertising space most of the time was used for announcing Information Classes in the Parishes of the Archdiocese. On that understanding the advertising cost for the Home Study part of the program was $50,942.80. Paulist Fathers contribution for books, quizzes, stamps, stationery and so forth of $38,365.05 added to the advertising costs makes a total cash outlay for the six years of the Home Study School of $89,307.85. To compute approximately what it cost the Home Study School to produce various effects is a simple enough matter. Since 35,784 persons were sent the Free Course, the over-all cost (advertising, books, quizzes, stamps, stationery, etc.) of getting the Course into prospective converts' hands was about $2.40 a person. Since 7090 persons sent at least one test, showing that they were devoting time and thought to the study of the Catholic Religion, the over-all cost of producing this effect for each person was about $12.59. Since 3422 persons have thus far graduated from the Home Study School in Chicago, the over-all cost to produce each graduate was about $26.09. Since 1214 persons were received into the Church or notified the School that they were going under personal instructions of a Priest with the presumed intention of entering the Church on the completion of their personal instructions, the over-all cost in Chicago on the material side of bringing the person into the Faith was about $73.00 a person.

AFTER STUDY PEOPLE WRITE

Why do people answer the ads and send for the Course and what effect does the Home Study of the Catholic Religion have upon them? The best way, perhaps, to answer a question of this type is to see what the students concerned have written about it and let them provide the answers. One man wrote, "I have silently and seriously felt the need of Religion but never did anything about it; some weeks ago I read in the Chicago *Tribune* about the offer you had to learn more about the Catholic Religion and I applied. Now that this is the last lesson and I have completed your Course I am sure that I will prepare for instruction to join with others in the worship of Our Lord, this time the true way." A lady who in beginning the Course wrote, "This is the first time that I have studied Religion seriously," had this to say at the end, "I can't express what a great blessing I have received during this Correspondence Course. There is lots yet I have to learn and understand. But with the help of God and the prayers of many wonderful people, I can accept." A man wrote about the effect of the study upon himself, "I would like to say that this Course has helped me so much in so many different ways. It has taught me a better appreciation of Religion and what it means. It has helped to teach me what the Catholic Church stands for in this world of unrest and what it has and always will stand for. I feel I have a very good idea of what the Church teaches and I am very interested in becoming a member."

Many people ask questions about the Church when they send in their tests. What are people who work the tests trying to find out about the Catholic Religion? Much can be learned from their queries. Some of the questions received at the Chicago Home Study School give an idea of the general trend of their difficulties. To the Catholic observer the questions demonstrate clearly that among numerous cross-sections of the population there is really very little intellectual opposition to the Church and the surface difficulties indicate that if the right approach is discovered some time without a sacrifice of doctrine to move people positively and of their own free will, there could be a large movement of conversions to the Church. Consider, for example, the weakness of the calibre of the usual questions. (1) "Why did Luther turn against the Catholic Church? Is it true they were selling indulgences in Germany? (2) Is it

true that Catholics pray to Mary instead of Jesus? Sometimes for forgiveness? (3) Why do they call Mary 'Virgin Mary'? How old was Mary when she gave birth to Jesus Christ? Did Mary have any more children, if so what were their names, if you know? (4) How do we know that Mary was a Virgin? (5) Is there any evidence in scriptures that Mary was indeed never actually subject to original sin? Did God Almighty free the Mother of God from pain when she gave birth? (6) In the celebration of Communion or Eucharist, why is transubstantiation any more necessary or significant than consubstantiation? Why should one verify the atonement and the other not? (7) What is meant by the true Church of Christ? One man tells me of his faith in God and of the doctrines of his Church; another man tells me of his faith and doctrines. Whom am I to believe? If I read the same Bible and get different concepts. (8) Do you believe that no one who is not a Catholic will get to heaven? Are Catholics forbidden to attend services at another faith? (9) Most people who are Christians cannot give a valid reason for their faith. Can a Priest of the Catholic Church do so? (10) When at Catholic has sinned, can he ask God in prayer to forgive him and be forgiven or is he required to go to Confession and confess his sins before he is forgiven? (11) If Judas and Peter were due to betray Christ and they did not—would not the prophecies be false? Since the prophecies were all in advance it seems to me they were born to commit this sin and had no say-so, eh? (12) Why is the Catholic Church against birth control when the world is overpopulated? Anyone who is never born will never miss what they never had. (13) If St. Peter was the leader and still conferred about doctrinal problems why does the Pope have sole supreme authority to make these decisions? (14) How long has the Church of Rome taught the infallibility of the Pope? What was issued in 1870? (15) Can one being be infallible in one thing and not infallible in something else?" From even a casual examination of these few typical questions it will be evident that there has not been much new ammunition manufactured against the Church in modern times and that the questions that good persons ask through the mail Course revolve around the familiar ones about Luther and the Reformation, Indulgences, Confession, the Eucharist, the Virgin Mary, Salvation outside the Church, Birth Control, Predestination, and the Pope.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DIFFICULTIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

A paper on this project probably should not be submitted without writing a few words about the difficulties met in organizing and sustaining the Advertised Free Home Study School. The main difficulty, of course, was raising the money. It took a lot of money, as you have seen, to advertise the Course or to "sow the seed," and to provide free Course Books and free postage for all who requested information. While a considerable amount of money was spent, probably the most frustrating aspect of the work was the realization of how much more could have been done spiritually if even more money had been available. A psychological drag on the perseverance of the Home Study School was the prospect of apparent waste. A real difficulty, as in many other projects, was the necessity of beginning and continuing the work for a considerable period on a part time basis because of commitments to other work. The increase in mail costs, of course, was another discouragement. These few difficulties are mentioned simply to give a more complete and accurate picture of the project.

Through the years from 1946 the system has remained essentially the same, namely, to advertise and supply a little information about the mystery and beauty of the Faith and to tell the reader if he would like to learn more, to send in the coupon at the bottom of the ad. Secondly, to offer a premium for all the work involved for the completion of the Course. Thirdly, to keep in contact with the inquirers who do not soon send in tests through encouraging follow-up letters. As time went on the system was added to by supplying "keys" for each test which told on what page the correct answer was found if the student had difficulty finding the answer. Another little innovation that seemed to work was the use of metered mail with an appropriate ad on all the envelopes. A small aid that seemed to help increase the percentage of tests sent in was the use of cartoons and picture stories which were enclosed in the envelope with the follow-up letter. But the most significant development came recently when the School was raised to Archdiocesan status in Chicago and put under the aegis of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and the School title became "Archdiocesan Home Study School of Religion." The work still remains under the direction of the Paulist Fathers but the School is naturally in a

stronger position for extensive service and growth because of the added stability and support that Archdiocesan status can supply.

THE CARDINAL ANALYZES

The work on whatever level it was done had been favored with high Ecclesiastical favor and support. Without this approval and support it could not, of course, even have got started, let alone sustain the problems that developed through the years. Since this paper has been mainly about the work in the Chicago Archdiocese during the tenure of His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, who before his untimely death had been appointed Pro-Prefect of the Propagation of the Faith in Rome, his words upon the local missionary project of an Advertised Home Study School in its attempt to reach the problem of the uninterested and the unchurched are appropriate and should be of special interest. In the beginning of the work in Chicago in 1952 His Eminence wrote, "I am very much interested in your undertaking and I am sure that much good will come of it." Other quotations from following letters of His Eminence pertaining to the Advertised Home Study Course: "This is a good work and I beg God to continue to bless and prosper it." Then, "Anything that I can do to help I am most willing to do and I ask you to call on me when you need me." In his last letter on the subject in late 1956, His Eminence summarized in a few words and penetrated the whole knotty problem of approach in our times: "Really in our apostolate these days we must use what is good in modern methods. It is no longer possible for us to reach the public in any other way except through advertisements of the sort which you are distributing. I look upon this work as being outstanding in our efforts to bring others into the one fold."

Whatever progress and development may have been made in this work in the six year period examined, the larger part of the credit under God was due to the counsel and help of His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, who with fatherly interest and concern looked after the development of the School.

MAURICE M. FITZGERALD, C.S.P.

Chicago, Ill.

WHY TEENAGERS GO STEADY

The pros and cons of going steady in high school are frequently discussed by the students themselves in questionnaires and school assemblies. It would seem, however, that their conclusions are not actually true, and have had little or nothing to do in getting couples started or in breaking up. Moreover, many articles on the subject which have been published recently are possibly ineffective because they fail to reach down to the heart of the matter; the authors have been misled. The social reasons usually given—and they sound convincing—are false faces for the true reason for going steady. They have given the custom an air of dignity and sophistication, an appearance of propriety which needs to be unmasked. This may be achieved if to the usual moral and social arguments against going steady we press the evidence that no normally *adjusted* teenager feels the *need* to go steady.

Anyone dealing with the high school set these days is certainly aware that the problem of going steady has grown to serious proportions and has not yet begun to yield to all the recent publicity and efforts of parents, teachers, and retreat-masters against such premature courtships.

The voice of the Church has fallen on deaf ears. The expert moral opinions featured in the Catholic Press, and the public statements of those bishops who have taken a firm stand have not had the moral force with teenagers and many of their parents which priests and teachers presumed they would.

This refusal to accept the teaching of the Church is based on several factors besides the obvious lack of trust in the wisdom of the Church. First of all, going steady answers so perfectly a basic problem of so many of today's teenagers, that a custom which appears to them so popular, so natural, so desirable could not possibly be objectionable even when a teacher, confessor or retreat-master says that it is so, quoting the bishop of the diocese or one of the country's leading theologians. Secondly, some students will not accept the basic premise that going steady is an unnecessary occasion of sin. They will not be convinced that necking, petting and passionate kissing are sinful even for those who are going steady.

Thirdly, in those cases where there has been no sinful conduct when the young couple are together—and, admittedly, there are such cases—the steadies seem to have a good argument. However, one must not forget the possible complication of solitary sins which are unquestionably caused by this relationship which is giving a constant, exaggerated emphasis on sex in the life of an adolescent at the very time it is already naturally very strong and needs to be de-emphasized as much as possible.

So, the efforts thus far against this teenage problem have not been very successful. An analysis of the psychological causes of going steady, however, might be a more valid approach, and offers a more realistic hope for a permanent answer. In brief, the thesis would be this:

Every teenager has four important spiritual needs: (1) psychological security, (2) moral guidance, (3) respect as a person and (4) constant reassurance of being loved. He naturally expects these from his parents. When they fail him—for whatever reason—he seeks a substitute in his "steady." The moral danger of the situation lies in the very nature of this relationship.

Psychological security is the anchor a teenager needs in the midst of all the physical and emotional changes going on within him, in addition to all the political and scientific changes going on in the world around him. His home and his parents must provide this security. His home must have an atmosphere of peace, harmony, efficiency, stability. It must be a calm island in the middle of a seething world, a strong fortress against which not even the forces of hell may prevail. His parents must be mature, happy partners, confidently meeting each day's minor perplexities and life's great decisions with a sense of proportion and a serenity of spirit that come from natural good sense and a deep trust in Divine Providence, neither of which are obtained by academic degrees in child psychology. Such parents are not baffled by the problem of guiding a child from infancy to maturity. A teenager with such parents sails through the storms of adolescence with an equanimity that is a joy to behold.

But if he finds at home only turmoil, cramped living conditions, constant economic difficulties, emotionally unstable parents, anger, drunkenness, profanity, quarrelling, perhaps even physical violence, he will quite understandably want to run away from it all. In other cases, the conditions at home may not be so deplorable, may even

be apparently ideal, and yet there is a wide gulf between the parents and the child caused by personalities, social and business interests, or just the plain impossibility of the two generations finding a common meeting of minds. The physical absence from the home of one or both parents (by death or marital difficulties) can cause the same void in the life of a child. By going steady the teenager acquires a friend, a confidante, who pledges loyalty, companionship, consolation, and who, above all, guarantees that there will be someone to cling to when he needs someone. She or he will provide the psychological security denied by the parents.

Secondly, a teenager needs and wants moral guidance, the inspiration and discipline necessary to support his immaturity and instability. His confusion about morality, social etiquette, personal and world problems is as great as his emotional insecurity and, again, if he cannot have the intelligent advice and sympathy of his parents, he or she will turn to another adolescent to be saved from such confusion. This partner will inspire and discipline and rule; and the adolescent is gladly dominated because this domination solves the immediate problems. That the price of this easy solution is the deterioration of his character as a human being, he fails to see.

The third need of an adolescent is to be accepted as a person; to attain such respect he will sometimes even commit a murder. Under proper guidance he may achieve the same satisfaction by becoming a saint, but our civilization puts such little value on growing in grace. It is unfortunate that parents do not better understand the importance of spirituality for their children, and all the little techniques of introducing them to the Divine Guest in their soul.

Depending, therefore, on the ideals he has been given and the values adopted by his companions, the high school student will seek recognition in sports, music or studies if he has talent for them; otherwise he will resort to wild driving, fads in clothes, haircuts and slang, adoration of the current juke-box idol, drinking, destruction of property, going steady, or whatever outlet is the acceptable mode for being accepted in his neighborhood. Those educationalists and psychologists who are still following Freud's heresy that sex is the predominant characteristic of adolescence would do well to study Rudolph Aller's proposition that the major development in adolescents is a growing consciousness of personality. To be respected as a person means, for a teenager, to be accepted into his family as

a young adult with the limited responsibilities and privileges of that station. If his parents refuse to let him grow up emotionally, refuse to accept him into their adult lives, refuse to let him do the good things adults do, fail to show him the meaning of adult responsibility, he will find his own way to show them he has indeed grown up. One way is the violation of law and authority, the other way is to find a girl or boy who *does* consider the adolescent an adult and tenders him or her all the respect due this new-found dignity.

The fourth need of an adolescent is most frequently indicated in the complaint of a teenager: "My parents don't understand me." This lack of understanding is actually a lack of true love on the part of the parents. They may be providing all the necessities and even the luxuries of life, but they do not give of themselves, their time, their affection. A teenager can only interpret this lack of vital concern for him as a lack of love. He may come to feel he was born as a biological accident, and that his parents begrudge him the sacrifices necessary to rear him. They give him no opportunity of getting to know them, or for them getting to know him; they are strangers under the same roof, sitting at the same table.

From them he wants to learn so many items of factual knowledge; he seeks their mature judgments on many topics. He wants so very much to show them the way he thinks and feels, his problems, ideals and ambitions, his interests, the important happenings in his daily life. He wants someone to talk to—the small talk of every day and the sacred converse in the rarer moments of his serious confiding. If he cannot thus talk with his parents he feels justified in thinking they cannot understand him or his viewpoints on matters where they differ. Without confidence in them he will resent their clumsy efforts at occasional guidance, and he will bristle at their authoritarian commands. Into such a state of affairs walks an attractive young partner with a kindly disposition; one, possibly, who has been hurt similarly, and in their common disappointment with their parents, these two find the sympathetic understanding they need so much.

Thus, two teenagers, drifting or driven from their parents, find in each other's charms (and sometimes in each other's arms) the fulfillment of their adolescent needs. When such a relationship even at the outset is so strong emotionally and so deep psychologically, it is not surprising that physical attraction and even spiritual love

become very strong. Students and their parents will never see the moral aspect of the problem until they are made to see it in this light. When there is no intention or possibility of marriage within a reasonable time, an exclusive and frequent association in high school is a spiritual risk without the slightest justification. Herein lies the judgment of the morality of the situation.

But besides satisfying the psychological needs of teenagers, the parents must at the same time help them to emotional maturity and psychological independence. Without such help, the growth of their personality is arrested, and with more or less serious consequences, they become permanent psychological cripples. By going steady a teenager may get the security, guidance, respect and affection he craves, but he is doing himself a far greater harm by making himself so dependent on one whose own position demands this same dependence. The confidence, courage and self-reliance we associate with manhood or womanhood will never have an opportunity to develop in such a relationship. It is for this reason that the high school phenomenon of going steady ought to be looked upon as one more sign of the break-up of the American home, one more penalty that is being paid for our way of life. J. Edgar Hoover sees it in this light and rates it as a national problem, our third greatest, after teenage crime and dope addiction.

It is without doubt more difficult and more complicated to train a child today than in the past. The changing style in family living has destroyed the unity of the family which by its very nature formerly provided the psychological needs of the child. Today, parents must invent opportunities where they and their children can share their lives. The Christian observance of Sunday in a family spirit would be a good beginning, and an effort to bring the family together at the evening meal or at least for an hour frequently during the week would carry through what the Sunday has begun. It may seem a ridiculous over-simplification, but the solution almost comes to this: parents must learn how and when to communicate with their children! The average teenager finds it difficult to enjoy a half-hour with his parents at the dinner table, yet a high school couple can sit in a parked car and talk for hours about the most ephemeral and the most sublime topics.

If the problem of going steady is seen in its deepest significance, the efforts of home, school, and church will be intensified in meeting

the challenge. The program will be one of long-range planning, but with immediate action along the following lines:

1.) The school and the church must wage a vigorous campaign of adult education. Discussions at special meetings for the parents who care enough to come, and Sunday sermons to reach as many others as possible must aim to show the existence of the problem, its nature and extent, the Church's views on the subject, and the basic cause in the failure of parents to meet the psychological needs of their teenage children. Indeed, the ideal relationship between parent and child must begin at the earliest years of childhood.

2.) Without exaggerating (or lessening) the evidence of the sins of impurity to which going steady leads in almost all cases, the students must be made to see *why* they really feel the *need* for going steady, the imprudence of such a solution, and the reflection they are casting on their home and their parents. (It is hardly of much use, moreover, to do this only in the marriage course for high school seniors when so many freshmen are involved.)

3.) The school should adopt the policy of prohibiting the steadies from membership in all activities, or at least from being candidates for any election, award or honor. Expulsion from school might not be too excessive in individual cases of serious scandal to the student body.

4.) Finally, when all reasoning has failed, parents must invoke the commandment of obedience, and forbid the continuation of the relationship. The prohibition alone will not suffice, of course. Into the vacuum created in the life of the teenager must go a renewed effort at his studies and good reading, a renewed interest in long-forgotten friends and hobbies, a renewed enthusiasm in school activities, a part-time job, perhaps, but above all a whole new effort to win him back to the family. This is no easy task. But it is the only answer.

NORMAN G. WERLING, O.CARM.

Joliet Catholic High School
Joliet, Illinois

THE USE OF "EKKLESIA" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

II

In our discussion of the use of the word *"ekklesia"* in the New Testament, we have already noted two particular meanings: (1) It is used to indicate a gathering for a liturgical service—a "liturgical assembly." (2) It also indicates a Christian community that exists in a particular city or district—a "local church."[1]

There is, however, another use of the word which designates clearly enough an "ecclesiastical organization," but which is indifferent to the added notion of a particular locality. Hence we may point out a third use of the word. Paul, for example, will say of his doctrine: "And so I teach in all the churches,"[2] with no special area even implied. The churches do exist in particular places, but when Paul speaks in this manner, he is apparently not taking that fact into consideration. The "churches" are simply the "communities of Christians."

So also in writing to the Romans, he sends on the good wishes of those who are the followers of Christ in various places that are in no way specified: "All the churches of Christ greet you."[3] And in writing about the mission of Titus to take up a collection for the poor Christians in Jerusalem, Paul notes that he is accompanied by another disciple "whose services to the gospel are praised in all the *churches,*" and who, at an earlier date, "was also appointed by the *churches* to travel with us," that is with Paul himself.[4] He refers to all of these delegates on this mission of charity as the "messengers of the churches,"[5] the representatives of those Christians in various unspecified places, and he asks the Corinthians to be generous and charitable in this regard. By so doing, they will give to these messengers and to the Christians everywhere a proof of that goodness to be found among the Corinthians, of which Paul had so

[1] Cf. *AER,* CXL, 4 (April, 1959), 250-59.
[2] *I Cor.* 7:17; cf. also *I Cor.* 4:17; 14:33.
[3] *Rom.* 16:16.
[4] *II Cor.* 8:18-19.
[5] *II Cor.* 8:23.

often boasted: "Give them, therefore, in the sight of the *churches,* a proof of your charity and of our boasting on your behalf."[6]

When he came to defend his apostolate in this same letter to the Corinthians, Paul points out that, although as an apostle he had the right to be supported by them, he did not ask for such assistance when he first came to them: "I stripped other *churches,* taking pay from them so as to minister to you."[7] It was the Christians of other communities who had supported Paul in those days, and yet Paul gave everything he had to give to the Christian community he was forming at Corinth. Thus he will ask, by way of comparison: "For in what have you been less favored than the other churches—unless in this, that I was no burden to you?"[8] Paul insisted always on his equal concern for all of these various communities; they were a continual source of concern to him: "Besides those outer things, there is my daily pressing anxiety, the care of all the *churches!*"[9]

In a similar fashion, Paul compliments the Christians at Philippi for their special role in assisting him materially in the first days of his ministry: "But, Philippians, you yourselves also know that in the first days of the gospel, when I left Macedonia, no church went into partnership with me in the matter of giving and receiving but you only."[10] So also, in thanking Prisca and Aquila for their great favors to him, Paul points out that the various Christian communities among the Gentiles are similarly grateful for what they have done: "To them [Prisca and Aquila] not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles."[11]

In these various texts, we can see an approach to a more abstract notion of the *"ekklesia,"* representing not a liturgical assembly or a community in a specifically-named city, but simply the "churches" in general. The *overtones* of the local element are still recognizable, particularly in the use of the plural form; but there is no singling out of any particular city or district. This more general manner of speaking, which more or less gathers all the various local communities into one concept, is evidenced also in Paul's remark concerning

[6] *II Cor.* 8:24. He also says to the people at Thessalonica, *II Thess.* 1:4: "And because of this we ourselves boast of you in the *churches* of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions. . . ."

[7] *II Cor.* 11:8.

[8] *II Cor.* 12:13.

[9] *II Cor.* 11:28.

[10] *Phil.* 4:15.

[11] *Rom.* 16:4.

the practice of women praying without covering their head: "We have no such custom, neither have the churches of God."[12]

Certain other passages, however, seem to approach an even more abstract note. However, they also touch upon the organizational nature of the visible community, something consisting of members, with various offices proper to each. This is the church that *de facto* exists in the local communities, although these individual passages more or less ignore that relationship to a locality, and consider only the organizational elements.

The famous chapter on the Mystical Body in I Corinthians ends with the statement of the comparison Paul wishes to make: "Now you [people] are the body of Christ, member for member."[13] He then goes on to note: "God indeed has placed some in the *church,* first apostles, secondly prophets . . .," and so on, through the more important offices and gifts found among the Christian community.[14]

Paul's words to Timothy are obviously concerned with the organizational elements of the Christian community in any city whatsoever; he indicates, however, no limitation of his thought to any special city or district. He asks concerning possible bishops, for example: "If a man cannot rule his own household, how is he to take care of the *church* of God?"[15]

He also points out to Timothy the reason why he has written. While he hopes to come to Ephesus soon, he fears that he may be delayed, and he wishes to instruct him "in order that thou mayest know, if I am delayed, how to conduct thyself in the house of God, which is the *church* of the living God, the pillar and mainstay of the truth."[16] Paul makes use here of a grand image expressed also to the Corinthians: "For you [people] are the temple of the living God, as God says: I will dwell and move among them, I will be their God and they shall be my people."[17] Thus the Christian community is again called the "temple" or "house" of God, and Paul explains what this community is: the church of the living God. It is especially in the phrase "the pillar and mainstay of truth" that we can note a non-localized sense, even though Paul is writing to Timothy at Ephesus; it follows his words on the requirements of a bishop and deacon.

[12] *I Cor.* 11:16.
[13] *I Cor.* 12:27.
[14] *I Cor.* 12:28 ff.
[15] *I Tim.* 3:5.
[16] *I Tim.* 3:15.
[17] *II Cor.* 6:16.

This same thing is true of Paul's concern for widows. What he says in this regard would be true of the "church" in a more abstract sense. He points out that it is the duty of Christian relatives to care for those women who have been widowed, and that, when there are such close relatives at hand, this care should not be passed on to the entire community: ". . . do not let the *church* be burdened [in such cases], in order that there may be enough for those who are truly widows," that is, those with absolutely no one to care for them.[18]

St. James refers to the church in one passage, indicating the Christian community, but not as found in any particular city: "Is any one among you sick? Let him bring in the presbyters of the *church*. . . ."[19] The same idea pervades Paul's repeated statement: "I persecuted the *church* of God."[20] This is something that he did chiefly at Jerusalem, but to which he later refers as though speaking of a more general or abstract idea.

Other passages seem to carry with them this same note. In chapter nine of the Acts, St. Luke notes after his treatment of the conversion of St. Paul: "Now throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria the *church* was in peace and was being built up, walking in fear of the Lord. . . ."[21] The advice given by Paul to the Corinthians seems also to denote a "church" that is less localized than the Corinthian community, used as it is in conjunction with a reference to the "Jews and Greeks," considered more as nations than local groups of those two nationalities: "Do not be a stumbling-block to Jews and Greeks and to the *church* of God. . . ."[22]

In regard to the description of the Church in this last passage—the church "of God"—there seems to be no special reason for laying undue emphasis upon the phrase. It is a Pauline phrase, appearing about thirteen times in all: once in the Acts (in Paul's address to the presbyters from Ephesus), six times in the Corinthian Letters, twice in the Letters to the Thessalonians, twice in I Timothy, and once each in Galatians and Philippians.[23] It would seem to be

[18] *I Tim.* 5:16.
[19] *James* 5:14.
[20] *Gal.* 1:13. Cf. also *I Cor.* 15:9; *Acts* 8:3.
[21] *Acts* 9:31.
[22] *I Cor.* 10:32.
[23] *Acts* 20:28; *I Cor.* 1:2; 10:32; 11:16; 11:22; 15:9; *II Cor.* 1:1; *I Thess.* 2:14; *II Thess.* 1:4; *I Tim.* 3:5; 3:15; *Gal.* 1:13; *Phil.* 3:6.

used by Paul with no special significance, apart from its obvious meaning that this is a community which pertains to God, which belongs to Him, since it is God who willed the Church and who has organized it.[24] Paul uses the phrase to refer to a local church (Corinth), to those churches in a certain district (Judea), as well as to the more abstract notion of church that appears in I Timothy. In three instances, he uses the phrase in his confession: "I have persecuted the church of God." This may be a special manner of emphasizing that in doing so, he had thus attempted to thwart the Will of God.

It is, finally, in the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians that this abstract note is raised to an even higher level.[25] This may indicate a fourth use of the word in the New Testament. In these letters, the Christian community is taken out of its local circumstances, and the organizational notions are passed over in favor of another aspect of the Church's life. Paul approaches the Church from another point of view, and emphasizes in a more *theological* fashion its essential relationship to Christ.

Paul's earlier references to the Mystical Body (especially in I Corinthians and Romans) were concerned with the influence of the Spirit on the members of the Church, and with their relationship to one another as members of the Church.[26] In Colossians and Ephesians, however, the concern is transferred to the relationship between the Church and Christ. Paul lays special emphasis now, not upon the members, but upon the Head: Christ is the divine Head, the Christian community is the body, the extension of Christ, completing Him in time and space:

"Again, he [Christ] is the head of his body, the *church;* he, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things he may have the first place. . . . And all things he [God] made subject

[24] *I Cor.* 12:28: "And God indeed *has placed* some in the church. . . ."

[25] There is some obscurity about the meaning of *Heb.* 12:23: ". . . and to the church of the firstborn who are enrolled in the heavens. . . ." Whether these "firstborn" are those in heaven or on earth is difficult to say, but it would seem at least probable that it refers to those who were members of the Christian community: those first rescued from the *"massa damnata,"* and reborn through the merits of Christ.

[26] *I Cor.* 12:12 ff.; *Rom.* 12:4 ff. Cf. also *Gal.* 3:28: "For you are all one [person] in Christ Jesus."

under his feet, and him he gave as head over all the *church,* which indeed is his body, the completion of him who fills all with all."[27]

Paul, chosen as a minister to preach the gospel of Christ, rejoices in the sufferings he undergoes for the sake of the members of this new Christian community: "I rejoice now in the sufferings I bear for your sake; and what is lacking of the sufferings of Christ I fill up in my flesh for his body, which is the *church,* whose minister I have become in virtue of the office that God has given me in your regard."[28] This gospel preached by Paul opens up the mystery hidden from eternity, and it is now through this Church—the Christian community, redeemed by Christ—that the wisdom of God is to be made known:

"Of that gospel I was made a minister by the gift of God's grace, which was given to me in accordance with the working of his power. Yes, to me, the very least of all saints, there was given this grace, to announce among the Gentiles the good tidings of the unfathomable riches of Christ, and to enlighten all men as to what is the dispensation of the mystery which has been hidden from eternity in God, who created all things; in order that through the church (*ekklesia*) there be made known to the Principalities and the Powers in the heavens the manifold wisdom of God. . . ."[29] This is the task of the Christian community: to preach this mystery as did Paul "among the Gentiles," it is true, but even more: the Church is to "enlighten all men" in this regard, preaching so far and wide that even the angels of heaven will hear, and learn through the Christian community what had been hidden even from them.

It is in this sense that Paul concludes with the final prayer: To God, then, "be glory in the *church* and in Christ Jesus down through all the ages of time without end."[30] It is the Church, in Christ and with Christ, that will accomplish all of these tasks.

In the following chapter, Paul mentions the spirit that must prevail among the Christian community. They have all entered into this *"ekklesia"* by baptism, and they must accordingly strive to preserve the "unity of the Spirit" that is theirs.[31] In chapter five,

[27] *Col.* 1:18; *Eph.* 1:22-23.
[28] *Col.* 1:24-25.
[29] *Eph.* 3:7-11.
[30] *Eph.* 3:21.
[31] *Eph.* 4:1-6.

he goes on to give a further application of this doctrine to the Christian family. The spirit of humble submission to Christ that must fill the life of a Christian is exemplified in the subjection of the wife to her husband: ". . . a husband is head of the wife, just as Christ is head of the *church,* being himself saviour of the body."[32] This basic union between the community and Christ, however, is but exemplified in the union of husband and wife; it is far more profound, far more intimate than that. Paul assures us, accordingly, that "this is a great mystery—I mean in reference to Christ and to the *church.*"[33]

From these many texts, we may now begin to formulate some sort of conclusion in regard to the use of *"ekklesia"* in the New Testament. Passing over for the present the question about which of these uses would represent the basic concept adopted by the primitive Church, we may point out these different meanings.

It is generally stated that there are two distinct uses of the word "church" in the New Testament. One indicates the local church, and the other the more abstract notion of the "people of God." This second meaning is frequently considered as a notion derived from a similar line of thought current among the Greek-speaking Jews of the Old Testament era.

There may be some reason, however, for suggesting that these two classifications are too absolute to include some of the varied nuances in the New Testament writings. A four-fold classification might possibly prove of greater assistance:

1) There is the notion of an "assembly"—an *"ekklesia"*—that is gathered together for liturgical worship. This is not in opposition to the notion of a local community, but it is a precision of that idea. An "assembly" exists only as long as the people are actually gathered together within the confines of an "assembly-hall" of some sort.

2) There is also the notion of a local church precisely *as* a local church: the community in Corinth, in Rome, in Ephesus. This is a very determined group; its membership could have been numbered, had we been present in those various cities and come to know the community.

[32] *Eph.* 5:23-29.
[33] *Eph.* 5:32.

3) There is, however, the notion of an "organized church," that still has over-tones of the local community and which stresses the notion of bishops, of offices, of members, but which is more or less indifferent to local circumstances. It is a more abstract manner of speaking about the Church, but it does not ignore in any way the organizational elements.

4) There is, finally, the even more abstract notion of the Christian *"ekklesia"* insofar as it is related to Christ, its divine Redeemer and its Head. The organizational elements are not denied in any way; nor are they set-aside in the sense of excluding them. They are, quite the contrary, taken for granted even though they are not being consciously considered at the moment.

These various meanings can all be noted in the passages we have discussed. Some particular passages, of course, may be questioned; it is difficult to say with absolute certainty in every instance just what the precise meaning might be. Yet the over-all consideration of the entire body of texts will indicate these general lines of thought. There is no contradiction between these various meanings we have singled out, at least from a Catholic and dogmatic point of view. We do not, in other words, have to make a choice between one or the other. We accept all of them simultaneously and with no difficulty, since the differences result only from the point of view adopted in using the word *"ekklesia"* to describe the Church.

There may be evidence of some development from a more localized to a more abstract use of the word; this we do not deny, and we shall return again to a consideration of that problem. We do insist, however, that in all instances any such development has been a "homogeneous" progress, something along the same line, representing a harmonious development, and that in accepting the New Testament, whole and entire, as the inspired Word of God, one will not be faced with insoluble conflicts touching upon the essential nature of the Church established by Christ.

JOHN L. MURPHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

TECHNICAL EXCELLENCE IN THE TEACHING OF CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

Up until a very few weeks ago, a certain number of Catholic publicists, lecturers and writers had been attracting a considerable amount of notoriety by publicly decrying what they considered to be the lamentably weak scholarly condition of Catholic colleges and universities in the United States. At the moment, however, this particular sort of corporate public confession by Catholics seems to have been discontinued. Another type of charge against the process of instruction within the Church has replaced it. And this latest attack is much more serious than the old one.

Essentially this latest charge is a claim that the presentation of the Christian message within the Catholic Church lags hopelessly behind the technical activity of the world around us today both in the line of the skill expended and in that of effectiveness achieved. Father Tavard, in his latest book, *The Church, the Laymen, and the Modern World,* thus formulates this claim:

> As it is commonly presented, the Christian interpretation of the world, be it Catholic or Protestant, is not on a level with technics of production, comfort, and fun. An amazing amount of imagination is poured into pioneering ways of enjoying life. How little imagination is put at the service of the Church can meanwhile be gauged any day by reading Catholic "literature" or listening to Catholic speakers. The mind that explains the catechism and the one that runs a factory have not been measured on the same scale. The latter is a master of technique. The former has at its disposal the fullness of Revelation, but fails to make it a living and telling message. There is no bridge from the one to the other. Such a bridge is yet to be built.[1]

Here, as elsewhere in his book, Father Tavard is indulging in the broadest kind of generalization. He shows himself quite displeased with Catholic writings and with Catholic speakers. And he claims that "the mind that explains the catechism," having the fullness of revelation at its disposal, is failing to make that body of teaching "a living and telling message." He leaves no room here for an allowance that some Catholic writers or some Catholic lec-

[1] *The Church, the Layman, and the Modern World.* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959), p. 25.

turers might be doing good work, or that, occasionally at least, the body of doctrine set forth in the catechisms of the Catholic Church might be expressed and explained in a competent and satisfactory manner.

It hardly seems that Father Tavard would wish to have his sweepingly adverse criticism of Catholic writers, Catholic speakers, and Catholic instructors in Christian doctrine taken quite literally. In point of fact, we can easily observe that there are incompetently written Catholic books, and that some Catholic speakers are definitely not masters of the subjects in which they try to lecture. There are such things as inadequate and even inaccurate expositions of Christian doctrine. But it is definitely not true that all of those who write, lecture, and instruct on the subject of the Catholic faith are doing unsatisfactory work. And furthermore it is inaccurate, unjust, and eminently uncharitable to give the impression that the explanation of the truths contained in the Catholic catechism is being done in such a way that those who teach these subjects "fail to make it a living and telling message."

We must not lose sight of the fact that the work of explaining the catechism is, in the last analysis, the doctrinal work which has been entrusted by Our Lord Himself to St. Peter and to the apostolic college. The members of this college, united with and under the successor of St. Peter, are the men to whom alone this work belongs in the Church by divine right. The words of the allocution *Si diligis,* delivered by the late Pope Pius XII, must be remembered in this context.

> Christ Our Lord entrusted the truth which He had brought from heaven to the Apostles, and through them to their successors. He sent His Apostles, as He had been sent by the Father, to teach all nations everything they had heard from Him. The Apostles are, therefore, by divine right, the true doctors and teachers in the Church. Besides the lawful successors of the Apostles, namely the Roman Pontiff for the universal Church and the Bishops for the faithful entrusted to their care, there are no other teachers divinely constituted (*iure divino*) in the Church of Christ. But both the Bishops and, first of all, the Supreme Teacher and Vicar of Christ on earth, may associate others with themselves in their work of teacher, and use their advice; they delegate to them the faculty to teach, either by special grant, or by conferring an office to which the faculty is attached. Those who are

so called teach not in their own name, nor by reason of their theological knowledge, but by reason of the mandate which they have received from the lawful Teaching Authority. Their faculty always remains subject to that authority, nor is it ever exercised in its own right or independently. Bishops, for their part, by conferring this faculty are not deprived of the right to teach; they retain the very grave obligation of supervising the doctrine which others propose, in order to help them, and of seeing to its integrity and security.[2]

Actually, then, according to the authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church, "the mind that explains the catechism" is that of the *ecclesia docens* itself. The content of the Catholic catechism is, in the last analysis, the content of the message which the Church presents as the divinely revealed message it has received from its divine Founder. The one agency to which the teaching of this message has been divinely entrusted is the Catholic hierarchy of jurisdiction, the Roman Pontiff and the residential bishops of the true Church of Jesus Christ. All of the legitimate work of explaining the catechism is carried on either directly by the *ecclesia docens* or directly under its supervision and control. If there are any complaints against the "mind that explains the catechism," they are directed against the *magisterium* of the Catholic Church primarily and directly.

Father Tavard asserts, without any effort at appealing to evidence, that this "mind that explains the catechism" has not been measured on the same scale as the mind that runs the factories of our time. He seems utterly convinced that the manufacturers of our era are masters of technique, while the teachers of the Catholic Church's message of salvation are quite inept by comparison. Unfortunately he does not seem to understand just what the technique of explaining the body of Christian revelation really is.

He shows the depth of his misunderstanding in his most serious accusation against "the mind that explains the catechism," or, in other words, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church and those whom they have commissioned to aid them in the carrying out of their doctrinal commission. It is Father Tavard's belief that this agency "has at is disposal the fullness of Revelation, but fails to make it a living and telling message."

[2] Translation in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXXI, 2 (Aug., 1954), 133.

Now it is quite impossible to discuss, or even seriously to consider, these charges set forth in Father Tavard's book without calling to mind the technique the *ecclesia docens* and its agents are obligated to use in asserting and explaining the Catholic Church's divine message. What the true Church claims to teach and actually teaches is not some popular philosophy, but, as the Vatican Council put it, "the salutary doctrine of Christ."[3] The Pope and the other members of the apostolic college, and those whom they commission to aid them in their task of presenting and explaining the Church's doctrine, act as the ambassadors of Christ. In the most brilliant and important of all his doctrinal pronouncements, the encyclical *Humani generis,* the late Pope Pius XII brought out the fact that in the Church's ordinary *magisterium* as well as in its solemn doctrinal judgments, the words of Our Lord: "He who hears you, hears me," are verified.[4]

Hence it is immediately apparent that no teacher of the Catholic Church, whether he be actually a member of the apostolic college itself or some individual who has been privileged to receive the commission to aid and co-operate in the doctrinal mission of the apostolic college, is meant to "make" the Church's teaching into "a living and telling message" or anything else. It is God Himself who has constituted the doctrine of the Church the most living, effective, and practical of all the bodies of teaching available to the children of men. It is the business of the teacher of the Catholic faith so to write and speak that his readers and hearers receive exactly what Our Lord Himself has taught to His people in His Church. It is a perversion of the office of the teacher of Catholic truth to add anything to the message of Christ, to take anything out of that message, or to twist or change the meaning of any doctrine contained within it.

The objective then of the "mind that explains the catechism" is a doctrinal activity of which it is true to say: "He who hears you, hears me." The realization of that objective is the first and the most important step in the direction of a successful technique of teaching the Catholic doctrine or the Catholic religion within the true Church. And it must be remembered that this objective is true even within the activity of the teaching of sacred theology, which

[3] Cf. *Denz.,* 1781.
[4] Cf. *Denz.,* 2313.

is the highest and the most important part of the doctrinal activity which God has commissioned to the apostolic college and its leader.

This objective is set forth in the *Testem benevolentiae,* one of the greatest pontifical documents of the nineteenth cntury. In this letter Pope Leo XIII declared:

> This stands, as it were, as the foundation of the new opinions about which we have been speaking: in order that those who differ from us may be drawn more readily to the Catholic wisdom, the Church ought in some way to approach more closely to the humanity of a mature era, and relaxing its ancient severity, show indulgence to the newly formed popular preferences and reasonings. And many think that this must be understood, not only with reference to discipline, but also with respect to the doctrines in which the deposit of faith is contained. For they contend that, to attract the wills of those who differ from us, it is opportune to pass over certain points of doctrine as of lesser moment, or to soften these teachings in such a way that they no longer retain the meaning which the Church has constantly held.[5]

The text of the *Testem benevolentiae* repudiates this teaching as running counter to the truth set forth in the last paragraph of the fourth chapter in the Vatican Council's constitution *Dei Filius.*

> Nor is the doctrine of faith, which God has revealed, proposed as a philosophical discovery which is to be perfected by human talents, but [it is proposed] as a divine deposit handed over to the spouse of Christ to be guarded faithfully and to be declared infallibly. Hence also that meaning of the sacred dogmas is always to be retained which the Holy Mother Church has once declared, nor must one depart ever from that meaning under the pretext or in the name of some more lofty understanding.[6]

There is genuine and recognizable technical excellence in the work of the Catholic theologian or of any teacher of the Catholic religion when the resources of the individual writer or teacher are exploited for the exact attainment of this objective. This obviously presupposes and demands on the part of the individual teacher or writer an exact understanding of what Our Lord's message on any individual point really is and means. This understanding can only

[5] *Denz.,* 1967.
[6] *Denz.,* 1800.

be gained through a study of the pertinent teachings of the Church's living *magisterium.* And, as the Vatican Council itself has pointed out, in that same constitution *Dei Filius,* this study must be prayerful, serious and reverent.[7]

For that study the theologian or any other conscientious teacher of the Catholic truth has at his disposal all the resources of sacred theology, the resources which the great Melchior Cano summarized under the headings of his famed ten *loci theologici.* On the strictly theological level it is quite evident that no man can be considered as competent to write or to teach unless he is definitely at home in every one of these resources. And the effective use of these resources will inevitably bring the true theologian to the accomplishment of what Pope Pius IX and Pope Pius XII called "the noblest function of theology," that is, it will enable him to show that the teachings defined by the *magisterium* of the Catholic Church are found in Scripture and in divine apostolic tradition in exactly the same sense and with precisely the same meaning that they have in the declarations and the definitions of the *magisterium* itself.[8]

The technique proper to the science of sacred theology is to be found in the proper, reverent, and prayerful employment of the *loci theologici* in such a way as to bring out an accurate, complete, and clear statement of the teaching revealed by God through Our Lord Jesus Christ, and taught as such by Our Lord within His Church. The presence and the extent of this technique are easily observable in the writings of any theologian.

Furthermore, the technique proper to any teacher of the Catholic faith or of the Catholic religion can be only the skillful use of language and of pedagogical method in such a way that the hearer or the reader may gain from the teacher's exposition an accurate, complete, and clear statement of the Catholic message in the particular field the teacher is trying to explain. If the teacher is instrumental in forming in the mind of the learner a correct, complete, and unequivocal statement of what the Church teaches as divinely revealed, he is a success in his own calling, and he is a master of his own techniques.

It would be silly to imagine that this technique is easy, either in the field of scientific theology or in that of the ordinary teaching

[7] Cf. *Denz.,* 1796.

[8] Cf. *Denz.,* 2314.

of the Catholic religion. In the Catholic seminaries and universities of the world the undergraduate course in sacred theology takes four years, and is offered only to men who have the bachelor of arts degree or its equivalent. It involves a course of study which, in itself, is at least as difficult as that given in any other school of a university. It is thus mere nonsense to claim that "the mind that explains the catechism and the one that runs a factory have not been measured on the same scale." Actually both minds, in the present cultural situation, have been trained in rigorous and exacting courses of study. Both operations are difficult and demanding.

The mind that explains the catechism must work with accuracy, completeness, and clarity. Any man who believes the dogma of the Catholic Church on the authority of the Triune God who has revealed it will certainly recognize the need for complete and perfect accuracy in this operation. There could be no activity objectively more reprehensible than that of misrepresenting to those for whom the Son of God died on the Cross the divinely revealed message He addressed to them.

This accuracy, however, has to go with clarity. A man does not teach the Catholic message or explain the Catholic catechism properly unless he expresses the truth which he himself has conceived in clear and understandable language, and in the language of those to whom his teaching is directed. And this is no easy task.

In the sources of revelation, much of the revealed material is set in figurative or metaphorical language. We know that Our Lord Himself, during the course of His public life here on earth, frequently explained to His disciples in non-metaphorical language the truths which He had previously presented to them and to the multitudes in the form of parables. In exactly the same way, it is the business of the man who "explains the catechism" or who teaches the science of sacred theology in the Catholic Church to state in clear and non-figurative language the truths which are expressed metaphorically in the sources of revelation or in authoritative spiritual writings. The unfailing guide of the teacher of Catholic truth is always to be found in the declarations and the definitions of the Catholic *magisterium*.

One very striking example of truth set forth in metaphorical form in the basic documentation of sacred theology is the teaching about the nature of the true Church. In order to understand what

God has taught us about the meaning of the term "the true Church of Jesus Christ," as it stands in the sentence: "The Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Jesus Christ," we must be cognizant of the true meanings of the many terms employed in the New Testament to designate the true Church and its members. In the fabric of Sacred Scripture, all of these terms are used analogically, and most of them are definitely metaphorical. There can be no effective and accurate teaching about the true Church unless the real meaning of these terms is brought clearly and in non-metaphorical language to the people being taught.

In the teaching of the Catholic faith this step is absolutely imperative. It may be permissible to use other metaphors to explain the divinely revealed teachings, but these further or non-Scriptural figures of speech are of no avail whatsoever unless the man to whom they are addressed is made aware in proper and non-metaphorical language of the truths that are meant to be illustrated. And, in the technical climate of our time, this accuracy in clear and non-figurative language, in expounding Catholic doctrine, is all the more requisite. Merely or even predominantly figurative language, such as that found in the works of many Modernists, is definitely a hindrance in itself to an accurate statement of the Catholic faith.

Completeness is also necessary, and it also has its own difficulty. In his *Testem benevolentiae,* Pope Leo XIII condemned the idea that certain points of Catholic doctrine might be passed over or left out of consideration, on the pretext that they are of lesser importance. And he insisted that this cannot be done even with the idea of making Catholic doctrine as a whole more appealing or attractive to those outside the true Church.[9] Obviously this injunction applies most forcibly to those points of Catholic teaching which are most violently rejected by the enemies of the Catholic faith. Likewise it applies to those points of Catholic teaching which the squeamish and the liberals among us would consider as offensive even to well meaning non-Catholics.

Quite clearly the Catholic teachings which fall primarily within this class are the dogmas in which God instructs us about the necessity of the Catholic faith and of the Catholic Church for the attainment of eternal salvation. Similarly in our own time the dogma

[9] Cf. *Denz.,* 1967.

about the necessity of Our Lord Himself has begun to slip into this class. And it is always so easy to write beautifully about Our Lord and His Church without forming one sentence in which it is either stated or directly implied that no man can enter into the possession of eternal and supernatural life apart from His name and His Church. The technique of the successful teacher of Catholic truth assures the explicit and clear recognition of these unpopular Catholic dogmas.

The men who possess and exercise that technique, the successful teachers of Catholic truth who work in and under the direction of the *ecclesia docens,* are definitely not unskilled laborers in the intellectual field. It is definitely not true that, as a group, they have failed in their task of expounding God's revealed message within His Church. Certainly there are failures within the ranks of those who write and lecture on Catholic doctrine. There are men who misinterpret the Catholic message, who becloud it in meaningless metaphor, and who are ashamed or unable to state the supernatural truths to which the opponents of the Church take most violent exception. Yet it remains both inaccurate and unjust to predicate this failure of the body of Catholic teachers as a whole, and to dismiss "the mind that explains the catechism" as something devoid of culture and technique.

Father Tavard has seen fit, not only to show contempt for Catholic literature, Catholic speaking, and "the mind that explains the catechism," but he has also presumed to institute a comparison of Catholic religious teaching efforts with those of the Jews. He writes: "For while Jews fulfill their vocation of perpetuating fidelity to the Old Covenant, we may be neglecting ours of announcing the New."[10]

Now a man would be very naive indeed were he not aware of the fact that the explicit rejection and repudiation of Our Lord Jesus Christ lies at the center of Jewish religious teaching. And a Catholic priest must be very absent-minded if he deludes himself into the position of imagining that one can perpetuate fidelity to a series of documents which were essentially orientated towards an announcement of the Divine Saviour through the simple process of explicitly denying Him. For, if the Old Testament is what Our Lord said that it is, if the inspired text of St. Luke could assert

[10] Tavard, *op. cit.,* p. 77.

of Christ that "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded to them in all the scriptures the things that were concerning him,"[11] it should be quite obvious to any Catholic that the denial of Our Lord is simply incompatible with any genuine fidelity to the divine teaching contained in the books of the Old Testament.

The Church, the Layman, and the Modern World goes so far in the direction of public confession against the Catholic Church as actually to claim that the "radical ambiguity of the accomplishment of the Law by Christ acted as a stumbling block to not a few Jews of earnest religious convictions."[12]

Our Lord Himself gave a different account of His rejection by His compatriots. He offered this explanation in His last discourse to His disciples.

> If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin: but now they have no excuse for their sin.
>
> He that hateth me hateth my Father also.
>
> If I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have sin: but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.
>
> But that the word may be fulfilled which is written in their law: they hated me without cause.[13]

When we come to consider the matter attentively, we find that the sort of Catholic writing which seems at variance with the very words of Christ recorded on the pages of the New Testament is non-technical in the strongest sense of the term. The man who writes in this way is not producing a satisfactory work of Christian doctrine. We can only be grateful that this careless type of composition is the exception rather than the rule among those who set out to propose and to explain the truths set forth in the Catholic catechism.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[11] *Luke*, 24:27.
[12] Tavard, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
[13] *John*, 15:22 ff.

Answers to Questions

SACERDOS CAECUTIENS

Question: Just recently a *sacerdos caecutiens* obtained an Indult to celebrate a Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin or the *Missa Quotidiana Defunctorum.* Because of the new General Decree (DGRS), would it be asking too much of you to send me the answers to the following questions?

1. When celebrating the Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin:

a) Which one of the five Votive Masses must be said?

b) Is the fifth Votive Mass *de S. Maria* to be always said as given in the Missal?

c) Are any commemorations to be added?

d) Is there any obligation regarding those parts which are special for the liturgical seasons?

e) Is the priest having the Indult bound to recite the *Gloria* or *Credo* in any of these Masses?

2. When saying the *Missa Quotidiana Defunctorum,* if the Ordo permits:

a) Which oration is to be said?

b) Must the priest (*caecutiens*) add any commemorations?

Answer:

1. When celebrating the Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin:

a) He may use the fifth of the Votive Masses of our Lady at any season of the year; he must use this Mass on days when the Requiem Mass is not permitted by the calendar. If, however, he has sufficient sight, he may use the other four Votive Masses of the Blessed Virgin according to their season. He must abstain from celebrating Mass during the *Sacrum Triduum,* but he may say the same Mass three times on Christmas day.

b) The formulary remains the same. However, although I have seen no specific reference to the point, it would seem that he should omit the Alleluia verse of the Gradual from Septuagesima to the end of Lent.

c) No commemorations need be added, not even an *oratio imperata.*

d) See answer to b).

e) The Creed is never said. The *Gloria* is said whenever it would be said in the Mass of the day according to the calendar of the church in which the Mass is celebrated; on the anniversary of the celebrant's ordination day; on Saturdays.

2. When saying the *Missa Quotidiana Defunctorum,* if the Ordo permits:

a) No oration is specified. The *Fidelium* would seem appropriate unless the celebrant's sight is sufficient to permit the reading of the oration best suited to the intention for which the Mass is being offered.

b) Especially in view of the DGRS of March 23, 1955, one prayer is sufficient. The *Dies irae* need not be said at any time.

PURIFYING THE COMMUNION PLATE

Question: After giving communion to the people, is it necessary that the communion plate be purified into the chalice, or can it be done into the ciborium? I especially have in mind occasions when more than one priest would be distributing communion.

Answer: The *Ritus* directs that the paten used at Mass be purified into the chalice but there is nothing specified about the communion plate. There are circumstances in which the sensible and safe thing is to purify the plate into the ciborium. On the other hand, to do this regularly is to perpetuate the problem of having the same particles emerge a number of times. Purify into the chalice when possible.

TRANSFERRING THE HOLY EUCHARIST

Question: The last Sunday Mass in the basement begins a little earlier than the Mass in the upper church and the priest usually brings the ciborium to the upper church while the celebrant is at the altar rail distributing communion. Should the priest bless the people with the ciborium before putting it in the tabernacle?

Answer: The *Ritus* (X, 6) says that, when the celebrant returns to the altar after giving communion, he does not give a blessing to the people since he is going to give them one at the end of Mass. It would seem that, on this authority and for the same reason, viz. that the people are to recieve a blessing a short time later, the priest who is transferring the Holy Eucharist from the basement church to the main altar should not give a blessing with the ciborium but should put the Sacred Species into the tabernacle immediately.

FORMULA FOR BLESSING OF THROATS

Question: When I was on the West Coast in 1957, the priests in the house where I was stationed at the time were notified that the formula for the blessing of throats on the feast of St. Blaise had been abbreviated. The formula was shortened, if I remember correctly, to: *Per intercessionem Sancti Blasii liberet te Deus ab omni malo gutturis. In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.* The use of the formula was said to be optional. The priests in the section of my present assignment (in the South) know nothing of this shortened formula. Was it a local privilege or a universal one? Does the use of the shorter formula require the approbation of the local Ordinary?

Answer: I must be numbered among your present colleagues for I am not aware of any such shortened formula. Back in 1869 the SRC was asked if a priest could use the formula: *Per intercessionem B.M.V. et B. Blasii Martyris liberet te Deus a malo gutturis. Amen.* The answer was that the priest should say only: *Per intercessionem B. Blasii liberet te Deus a malo gutturis. Amen* (SRC 3196). Under date of February 1, 1924, a question was presented to the SRC about this decree in view of the fact that a different formula (as well as a special prayer for blessing the candles) was to be found in the Roman Ritual. The SRC this time directed that the oration and formula to be found in the Roman Ritual are to be used everywhere (SRC 4387). The current Pustet *Ordo* reminds priests, before St. Blaise's day, of this latter decree and emphasizes *ubique.*

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

VOCALIZING THE SACRAMENTAL PENANCE

Question: When a person receives as a sacramental penance the recitation of a number of Our Fathers and Hail Marys, must be recite these with the lips, or is mental recitation sufficient to fulfil his obligation?

Answer: The Our Father and the Hail Mary are *vocal* prayers, and hence when they are given as a penance they must be said vocally. In the words of Regatillo-Zalba: "A prayer [imposed as a penance] must be recited orally, not merely by reading it or mentally reciting it" (*Theologiae moralis summa,* III, n. 455). The same doctrine is taught by Cappello (*De Sacramentis,* II, n. 250).

A MARRIAGE CASE IN THE HOSPITAL

Question: A priest is called to a hospital to attend a patient who is very sick. He begins to hear the man's confession, and in the course of the confession discovers that he is involved in a "bad" marriage, which cannot be convalidated, because the patient's previous (and lawful) spouse is still alive. The man will not promise to renounce conjugal cohabitation in the event that he recovers, and accordingly is refused absolution. But how should the priest act in such a case regarding the administration of Holy Communion and Extreme Unction (which he has come prepared to give) since he knows the sick man's unworthiness only from confession?

Answer: The best procedure to be followed by the priest who finds himself in the difficult situation described by our correspondent is to tell the sick man to inform him *outside of confession* that he does not wish to receive the other two sacraments. For it is strictly forbidden for the priest to refuse these sacraments because of the information he derived from the man's confession (Can. 890, § 1). If the sick man will not accept this advice, and requests Holy Communion and Extreme Unction, the priest must comply with this request, even though he knows that the recipient is unworthy.

To avoid such an unfortunate situation, the priest should follow this procedure: Whenever he is summoned to give the sacraments

to a sick person, he should first inquire of him, before hearing his confession, if he is involved in an invalid marriage (unless, of course, he knows that such is not the case). If he discovers that the patient is in a marital complication that cannot at present be rectified, he should ask him if he is resolved to renounce his sinful association. If the sick person promises to fulfil his duty in this respect, the priest should require (if time permits) a statement to this effect before two witnesses, providing the case is public. Then the priest may administer the sacraments. If, on the other hand, the sick person is determined to continue in his sinful cohabitation, the priest can refuse to administer any sacraments without violating the sacramental seal, because the investigation of the patient's dispositions was made outside the tribunal of Penance. We are presuming that this refusal is not public (as it might be in a ward) because if one who is not publicly known to be unworthy requests the sacraments publicly, he should not be refused, even if the priest has knowledge outside the sacrament of Penance that the petitioner is unworthy.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE ADMINISTERED BY AN ORTHODOX PRIEST

Question: Has an Orthodox priest (that is, a priest belonging to one of the schismatic Oriental churches) the power to forgive sins in the sacrament of Penance, and if so, whence does he derive this power?

Answer: It is solidly probable that priests of an heretical or schismatic sect validly absolve penitents who confess to them in good faith. Some authors argue to this conclusion on the ground that in such cases there is common error, and the Church supplies jurisdiction. Thus, Iorio holds this opinion and adds: "It would be absurd to believe that the Church, loving mother as she is, would be unwilling in such cases to supply jurisdiction for the common spiritual good of so many faithful living in good faith" (*Theologia moralis,* III, n. 429). Others say that the Church has never taken away the jurisdiction in the sacramental forum from the Oriental priests even though they have lapsed into schism. The practical

conclusion is that a convert from a schismatic Oriental church should not be obliged to confess again those sins which he confessed properly to a schismatic priest, if he received absolution for them. It may be added that the Catholics of the Oriental rites commonly hold that the absolutions granted by the schismatic priests to their own people are valid. (Cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis,* II, n. 359.)

PHOTOGRAPHY IN CHURCH

Question: What should be the pastor's attitude in regard to the photographing of a wedding party in church, in such wise that the entire party are grouped on the platform of the main altar?

Answer: It might be argued that such a photograph will be a permanent reminder to the couple that they began their wedded life before the altar, in the sacred presence of Jesus Christ. For this reason it might be permissible for them to be photographed in front of the altar (but not on the platform) as they are about to leave the church after the ceremony. But I do not believe that it is fitting, or even permissible, to group the entire party on the altar platform.

USE OF THE FACULTY OF BINATION

Question: Is a pastor justified in binating on Sunday for the benefit of a community of nuns living only a hundred feet from the parish church, if they are all physically able to come to the church? They are not cloistered nuns. The Mass is merely for their greater convenience.

Answer: It is difficult to see how bination is justified in such a case. The Code (Can. 806, § 1) says that the Ordinary may grant a priest the right to binate when otherwise "a notable part of the faithful could not hear Mass on a Sunday or holyday of obligation," and although a generous interpretation may be given to the phrase "could not hear Mass" so as to include grave inconvenience, such an interpretation is evidently not possible in the circumstances described by our questioner.

A BRIBE FOR HOLY COMMUNION

Question: Recently I heard of a teaching nun in an elementary school who gives a dispensation from home work to any pupil who has received Holy Communion that morning. What is to be said of such a procedure?

Answer: Such an arrangement is worthy of severe condemnation. The Church does not approve of bribing children to receive Holy Communion. The only motives for approaching the altar rail should be motives of a spiritual nature. The bribe in this case is particularly reprehensible because it is calculated to promote laziness and indifference to study. Moreover, this form of reward might easily lead to unworthy communions on the part of some children. Any pastor who discovers that a teacher in his school is making use of such a method to promote frequent communion should take immediate and definite measures to stop the practice.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

THE SCHOLASTIC ANALYSIS OF USURY. By John T. Noonan, Jr. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957. Pp. 432. $9.00.

The Commercial Revolution of the sixteenth century was quite as significant for Western European Civilization as the Industrial Revolution that was to follow in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The productivity of money was once and for all demonstrated, pragmatically and incontestably. Investments, partnerships, credit, annuities, insurance, and, above all, banking became the very materials of which modern economy is built. The acquisition of profit from capital becomes a major motive force in commercial transactions, and the Capitalistic Age is upon us. At the same time, the question of justice in these transactions takes upon itself alarming proportions. The Usury Principle is challenged for the first time by practice which is quite at odds with prevailing theory. Even ecclesiastical authority defends (against overly zealous confessors) those who take interest. Today usury is largely considered as of mere academic concern. Is this merely the toleration of an objective evil which, in the new pluralistic society, cannot be effectively remedied? Or is the Church giving us to understand the genuine meaning of Her earlier teaching and saying in effect: "to take interest on a loan is not immoral in itself, but only thereby to exploit the poor or to fall victim to the vice of avarice; in short, to take immoderate interest"? Is the prohibition, then, of the natural law or only of positive law, civil, ecclesiastical, and divine (e.g. Luke 6:35)? This is the problem that faced the later Scholastics; its magnitude is attested to by the number of divergent solutions reached after centuries of often acrimonious dispute, by the fact that the Church Herself still holds many of these matters "sub judice," and by the reflection that the Usury Principle involves in embryonic form an entire theory of economics.

The task that Mr. Noonan has set himself is the reconstruction of this dispute. His perspectives are necessarily multiple: economic, juridic, sociological, theological etc., but the philosophical is the primary one. What the Scholastics ultimately sought, after all, was the natural law foundation for usury, and this remains the domain of reason even when the process is "imperated" by the superior wisdom which is theology. The order, however, is not the synthetic one of science but

that of history. The work is thorough in a comprehensive way; well documented; and restrained in tone. He has effectively eschewed any "a priori" thesis, indeed, the procedure is largely expository; but the analyses are in the main accurate, and critical enough to allow a definite judgment to emerge.

The evil of usury is not because of "turpe lucrum" merely, but because of a genuine injustice involved. And here there is no mere attempt to justify the Church's prohibition in natural law; more often than not her legislation is a result rather than a cause of the Scholastic analysis. When the theory is ultimately refined and re-evaluated one argument alone remains intact—that authorized by St. Thomas. Three centuries of exacting scholarship have uncovered invalid assumptions in every other proposed explanation: the legal argument involving transfer of ownership, Scotus' sale of time theory, riskless profit, the "just price" theory (the just price is variable, unlike money), the "labor value" theory (re-proposed by R. H. Tawney and Bede Jarrett in modern studies) etc. It is only because the use of money cannot be separated from the "corruption" of its substance that usury is wrong. This is the case only when money is taken in its very formal nature as a pure measure, a medium of exchange. But it is upon this formality alone that St. Thomas' argument rests. It does not involve a denial of the productivity of money in other capacities which can accrue to it. The "sterility of money" theory was Aristotle's, and though St. Thomas gives it some acceptance in his earlier works he sets it aside in all his later references to usury in favor of the "use—consumption" argument. The treatment of restitution in the "Summa" rather openly implies that money can bear fruit. It would be too much to say that St. Thomas had any premonition of the new uses to which money was to be put. Not until two and a half centuries later would historical developments enable Cajetan to distinguish between the absolute power of money as an exchange medium and its relative power as subject to industry. There is no difficulty in applying a thing instrumentally to purposes that lie outside the uses that are intrinsic to it (it is not the nature of water to bestow grace—as it does in baptism). The importance of this is that the illicitness of taking profit on a pure loan (and this must be understood as quite distinct from interest derived in virtue of extrinsic titles, such as risk, "lucrum cessans" etc.) can remain untouched and quite compatible with profit derived from a contractual relationship involving money, i.e. a legitimate credit transaction that is not the sin of usury.

In one final section to his work Mr. Noonan reflects upon the doctrine of the Scholastics from different perspectives: that of Calvin and

others who would justify interest upon a pure loan as intrinsically natural and condemn only excessive profit; and that of some contemporary humanists and sociologists (R. H. Tawney, H. Belloc, Max Weber etc.) whose misconceptions of usury have, more or less, issued in condemnations of modern finance capitalism. In the contrast their shortcomings are brought sharply to light.

This entire Scholastic debate was conducted within the living teaching authority of the Church. This dimension of the problem involves the study of numerous documents—papal encyclicals, bulls (twenty-six of these are closely examined), decrees of councils and synods, decisions of the Holy Office, Sacred Penitentiary, Rota, Propaganda etc.—which the author has entered upon. It is of interest to note how there is here too a process of explicitation and refinement. The Bull of John XXII *Ad Conditorem* is even at variance with the contents of two earlier Bulls, the *Exiit qui Seminat* of Nicholas III and the *Exivi de Paradiso* of Clement V. The case of usury illustrates concretely how the Church's understanding of a doctrine entrusted to Her can develop, and how philosophy and theology can function as instruments of the *magisterium* without losing their proper status as sciences.

The book is a genuine contribution; probably no better study of usury is available in any language. It suggests the need for studies similar to this one in other areas, where careful inventory of the data can off-set the overly facile formulations that distort reason from its true and deeper functions.

WILLIAM J. HILL, O.P.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION. By Alfred Wikenhauser. New York: Herder & Herder, 1958. Pp. xviii + 579. $7.80.

This first-class work has been well received in biblical circles ever since its first appearance in 1953, when it was written to replace the older introduction by Wikenhauser's predecessor at Freiburg, J. Sickenberger. A second, revised edition came out in 1956, and this is the basis of the present translation. Whereas the revisions appeared in a supplement at the end of the German edition, they have been smoothly worked into the text of the English edition.

Father Wikenhauser follows the familiar pattern of introductions: canon, text, and a special introduction to each of the books of the New Testament, with a complete personal and subject index. In this respect, the New Testament introductions may have something to learn from their Old Testament counterparts. Recent Old Testament intro-

ductions discuss the types of literature (funeral and war songs, thanksgiving and lamentation psalms, devotional stories, etc.) found in the Old Testament, before giving the analysis of individual books. While it is true that there is not such a wide variety of literature represented in the New Testament, the method has much to recommend itself. Thus one could discuss parables, hymns, liturgical pieces, apocalyptic, and the various units recognized by form criticism, before the special introductions. In this way the literary aspect of the New Testament would receive proper attention.

To make up for this, there is a whole section given over to a sober analysis of form criticism (253-277), to which a sympathetic but objective treatment is given. The author's remark that form criticism is not a means of historical criticism is well taken; the form of a passage provides no foundation for a judgment concerning its historicity. He also insists on the framework of the history of Jesus: "We must not regard the evangelists as mere collectors who juxtaposed the words and acts of Jesus quite superficially, and joined them with meaningless connecting words" (273). This method of treating form criticism as a unit is convenient and clear, but it has the disadvantage of putting it aside, and separating it from the special introduction to each Gospel.

The author notes the pertinence of Dead Sea Scroll discoveries to the study of St. John's Gospel. It was perhaps too late for him to record that the hierarchical structure of the Qumran community, with its "episcopus" (*paqid, or mᵉbaqqer*), forestalls the old objection to the Pauline authorship of the Pauline epistles on the basis of organization (449-450). On the other hand, the new Papyrus Bodmer II, published in 1956, is mentioned. All in all, we now have in English the best introduction to the New Testament that has been written by a Catholic. If a second printing is forthcoming, as the work deserves, it is strongly urged that "living source" as a translation (?) of *Sitz im Leben* be dropped.

ROLAND E. MURPHY, O.CARM.

HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN FEASTS AND CUSTOMS. By Francis X. Weiser, S.J. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1958. Pp. 366. $4.95.

In evidence of the growing interest in the sacred Liturgy, a number of books are daily appearing which deal with one or another facet of liturgical life. Some have focused their attention on the Mass; others on the Sacraments or the Divine Office. The present admirable work of Fr. Weiser was written to explain the origin, history, development

and observance of the numerous Christian feasts. In the words of the author, "this books presents a compendium of heortology."

The book is divided into three main parts. The first part treats of celebrations based on the natural time units and seasons of the year, for example, Sundays, Ember Days, and Rogation Days. In the second part the author discusses the celebrations based on the commemoration of Christ's redemptive work—Advent, Christmas, Easter, etc. The final part is devoted to a consideration of the celebrations based on the result and fruit of Christ's redemption in and through His saints. The treatment of the main feasts of the Blessed Mother is especially interesting and instructive.

The author has unearthed and compiled numerous enlightening facts relative to the history, liturgy and folklore of the Church's feasts. Of particular interest is his treatment of the feasts and practices which have been instituted or adapted by the Church to offset undesirable non-Christian celebrations and customs. This provides for a better understanding of the full significance of these feasts, as well as the rituals that have grown up with them. In short, this handbook exemplifies in a most concrete manner the words of the late Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Mediator Dei,* ". . . the Liturgical Year devotedly fostered and accompanied by the Church, is not a cold and lifeless representation of the events of the past, or a simple and bare record of a former age. It is rather Christ Himself Who is ever living in His Church."

The present book actually combines three of Fr. Weiser's previously published works—*The Christmas Book, The Easter Book,* and *The Holyday Book.* However, this compendium contains several new chapters and passages, and the subject matter has been rearranged to fit the purpose of a reference work. Although many details of religious and nonreligious folklore are given without reference to printed source material, this is quite understandable. Such matters are frequently difficult to document. However, the author tells us he has accumulated this information in the course of years through personal contact with experts on the folklore of various national groups. Moreover, whenever possible, the author cites sources. Out of consideration for readers not too familiar with certain terms frequently used in works of this nature, the author has wisely included an alphabetical dictionary of terms.

For priests interested in delivering sermons that will give the faithful a deeper insight into the meaning and spirit of the feasts of the Church, this book will be of invaluable assistance. Professors of Sacred Liturgy, well aware of the scarcity of books on this phase of liturgical life, will warmly welcome this compendium. And finally, because it is

written in a simple, clear, and very interesting style, it should be popular with the laity and do much to inspire a more fruitful celebration of the Christian feasts in the home. In the words of Bishop John Wright's preface, "The *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* is destined to become a classic in its field. May it be for many the key to a devout and meaningful observance of the Year of Our Lord."

RICHARD J. MURPHY, O.M.I.

PORTRAIT OF A PARISH PRIEST. By Lancelot C. Sheppard. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958. Pp. 189. $3.50.

This biography of the Curé d'Ars is a notable contribution to the rising tide of realism in hagiography. Mr. Sheppard undertook his study as a student of scientific history, acutely conscious that his work, to be acceptable, must square with the formidable principle, "No documents: no history." His research was thorough; and the product is satisfying. His crusading spirit, however, leads him to joust with windmills now and then, For example, he pointedly criticizes St. Patrick's Day dances in Lent, sermonizes about the inadequacy of seminary training in France during the past century, and casts more than a shadow of a doubt on the reality of Our Lady of La Salette in a summary presentation of the issue involved. But such meanderings are rare, and when they occur the author campaigns with such gusto we readily forgive him.

Mr. Sheppard writes for the characteristically impatient reader of today. The narrative canters steadily along, never pausing long enough to grow wearisome; and all the while the reader senses that the material is controlled by a master confident in his familiarity with the landscape. The style, too, is clean and crisp. All this is eminently suited to modern taste. It may be asked, however, if the profoundly simple spirit of the Curé is properly focused. "The mills of the gods grind slowly" surely applies to the making of the Saint of Ars; and humility and mortification are the basic components of his holiness. Admittedly, portraying such a spirit runs the risk of becoming tedious, for the strokes cannot be bizzare or the colors garish. Although Mr. Sheppard does not overplay the fascinating externals in the life of the Curé, he somewhat underplays his inner life. Nevertheless priest and layman alike will find *Portrait of a Parish Priest* informative and highly enjoyable.

MELVIN L. FARRELL

THE RESTLESS CHRISTIAN. By Kilian McDonnell, O.S.B. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1957. Pp. 183. $3.00.

The problem of lay spirituality is at last today commanding the attention it deserves. The present volume, written specifically with this problem in view, is a series of thumbnail sketches on exactly how Christian truths and virtues must be assimilated and integrated into the layman's life. There is no mere moralizing or devotionalizing in this work. Rather, the author has done an excellent job of achieving a good balance between the devotional and the dogmatic both in his choice and treatment of topics. Hence we find in each essay that the Church's doctrine on some truth or virtue is very clearly intimated, while at the same time there is always a practical, and usually unique, application of it in the layman's life with its peculiar needs and tensions.

The author does not have these essays follow at random, but has tried to weld the whole into a unity. In order to do this he uses the device of juxtaposing God and Man. The book is, therefore, divided into five sections: God—and Man; God's Word—and Man; God's World—and Man; God's Work—and Man; and finally The Life Beyond Life. Although it must be admitted that some of the topics treated under one section could just as easily be placed in another, this in no way detracts from the value of the work. Assignment of material must necessarily be somewhat arbitrary in a work of this kind.

Of course it is impossible to reproduce here in detail all the subjects treated in the work, but the following are a fair sample. In the first section, God—and Man, are reflections on God the Father, Christ, the Holy Spirit and Mary. An essay entitled, "Quiet Desperation," building on the theme of St. Augustine that "our heart is restless till it rests in thee," shows man's basic need for God; while another essay points out that the mystery of God lies in the mystery of love, that the infinite self-sufficient God wants the love of his creatures. Such subjects as the Bible, Baptism, Religious Education and Suffering are contained in the second section. The third considers the Christian and his relation to the world, in such titles as "Freedom and Holiness," "God and the Patriot," "The Rugged Individualist," "Christ and Lord." The very titles of the essays give some indication of the unusual treatment of the subjects. Important matters such as Marriage, Racial Discrimination, Prayer, Positive Catholicism are taken up in the fourth section of the book. Finally, as the title of the fifth section implies, this part of the work deals with Death, Purgatory, Resurrection and Heaven. The author should be complimented for stating the healthy attitude a Christian should have toward the reality of death, and his sound dogmatic treatment of heaven and purgatory.

Let it be said in conclusion that the author attacks each one of his subjects with a freshness and originality which cannot help but grip the imagination and interest of his reader. In a work of this sort one suspects that the writer is forced to try novel approaches, but there is no trace of striving for effect in this book; it comes naturally as the author produces from his treasures, "things new and old." The versatility of the author's approach, at one time ironic then irenic, at another, dogmatic then apologetic, enhances the many-sided appeal of Christian truth.

At the end of the work there is an excellent list of Suggested Readings particularly suited to the layman's need.

LIONEL A. DE SILVA, C.S.P.

HOLINESS IS FOR EVERYONE. By Martial Lekeux, O.F.M. Translated by Paul Joseph Oligny, O.F.M. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1953. Pp. 150. $2.50.

The greatest obstacle in the consideration of a life of holiness is the notion that such a life is reserved for a special few. Holiness is not a lofty, distant ideal. Every Christian must strive for this goal. Father Lekeux in twelve readable chapters shows that everyone can attain holiness. Good will and sincerity are the key to growth in holiness.

In *Holiness Is For Everyone,* the author effectively intersperses pithy quotations to enliven his thesis. The book has an interesting question and answer style; objections are posed and solutions are given, with stories and illustrations for background. It is a practical book with good insights into the problems that plague us daily. This work is ideal for beginners, but can serve, too, as an excellent review for the proficient.

In the struggle for peace of soul, Father Lekeux conveys the importance of confidence for the modern man. Without confidence, there can be no victory.

JOHN R. FEHSENFELD, C.S.P.

MOTHER OF GOD. By Cyril Bernard, O.D.C. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957. Pp. 174. $2.50.

Many books on Mary are dogmatic works that only theologians can properly appreciate. Some Marian works suffer from the other extreme; they are devotional, but fail to give the reader an appreciation of the Mother of God based on a solid theological foundation. *Mother of God*

by Fr. Cyril Bernard offers a happy balance of theology and devotion. This feature makes the book a welcome addition to the somewhat crowded library of Marian literature.

Father Bernard is a gifted author who combines the depth of a theologian and the simple, forceful style of a journalist. The result is a profound, inspiring and very readable work, showing Mary's unique role in the Divine economy of salvation. In his preface, Fr. Bernard states that his book is the "fruit of a lifetime of loving study." The reading of his book amply confirms this assertion. Fr. Bernard is thoroughly acquainted with the sources of Mariological thought—patristic writings, papal statements, and the works of the Saints and theologians. For the most part, citations from these sources are used effectively. In parts of the book, however, to the annoyance of the reader, quotations expressing the same idea are multiplied unnecessarily.

Mother of God is a relatively short work; yet it offers a remarkably complete exposition of Mariology. The book is divided into sixteen chapters. Each chapter deals with one of Mary's special privileges or titles. Among other prerogatives, Mary's Immaculate Conception, Assumption, Co-Redemption and universal Mediation are given the thorough treatment they deserve. Fr. Bernard also treats briefly the more popular Marian devotions. The last chapter contains an excellent short account of the apparitions of Our Lady of Fatima.

Fr. Bernard develops each of Mary's prerogatives in the same precise and scholarly manner. In each case, he traces the history of the dogma in the early writings of the Church, the liturgy, etc. The author also includes an account of the heresies centering about points of Marian doctrine. What is more important, Fr. Bernard presents the theological aspects of Mariology with a directness and clarity that the average reader will greatly appreciate.

RONALD J. RAFFERTY, C.S.P.

Books Received

DECISION FOR CHINA: COMMUNISM OR CHRISTIANITY. By Paul K. T. Sih. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1959. Pp. xxiv + 262. $4.50.

PRAYERS FROM THEOLOGY. By Romano Guardini. Translated by Richard Newnham. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959. Pp. 62. $1.50.

SELECTED EASTER SERMONS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE WITH INTRODUCTION, TEXT OF THIRTY SERMONS, NOTES AND COMMENTARY. By Philip T. Weller. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. vii + 329. $4.95.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH INVITES YOU. By James V. Linden, S.J. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. ix + 118. $2.50.

THE FAITH EXPLAINED. By Leo J. Trese. Chicago: Fides Publishers, 1959. Pp. xii + 564. $5.95.

CONVENT READINGS AND REFLECTIONS. By Rev. Bruno M. Hagspiel, S.V.D. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. xiii + 274. $4.25.

STIR UP THE FIRE: CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PRIESTHOOD. By Ludwig Weikl, S.J. Translated by Isabel and Florence McHugh. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. xvii + 233. $4.50.

NINE SERMONS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE ON THE PSALMS. Translated and Introduced by Edmund Hill, O.P. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1959. Pp. xi + 127. $3.50.

THE PARABLES OF JESUS. A POPULAR EXPLANATION. By Francis L. Filas, S.J. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. xi + 172. $3.75.

THE MOVEMENT OF WORLD REVOLUTION. By Christopher Dawson. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1959. Pp. 179. $3.00.

THE EUCHARIST AND CHRISTIAN LIFE. Second Series. Theological Studies and Supernatural Psychology Concerning the Blessed Sacrament. Adapted from the original work of the late Isidor Cardinal Goma. By Bishop Aloysius J. Willinger, C.SS.R. Fresno, Cal.: Academy Library Guild, 1958. Pp. 221. $2.00.

THE PARADISE TREE: ON LIVING THE SYMBOLS OF THE CHURCH. By Gerald Vann, O.P. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1959. Pp. 320. $4.00.

A MAN CLEANSED BY GOD. A NOVEL BASED ON ST. PATRICK'S CONFESSION. By John E. Beahn. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959. Pp. 175. $3.75.

PRÉCIS D'HISTOIRE MONASTIQUE. By Patrice Cousin. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1956. Pp. 594, with seven maps. Price not given.

PROBLEMS IN THE LITURGY. By Gerard Montague. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959. Pp. xvi + 451. $5.50.

FAITH AND UNDERSTANDING IN AMERICA. By Gustave Weigel, S.J. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. 170. $3.75.

GUIDE FOR RELIGIOUS ADMINISTRATORS. By Paul Hoffer, S.M. Translated by Gabriel J. Rus, S.M. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. viii + 171. $4.50.

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR IN THE MINOR SEMINARY. By Valentine W. Young, O.F.M.Cap. Washington: Capuchin College, 1958. Pp. viii + 72.